DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 017 JC 740 458

TITLE	Equality of Access to Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.
PUB DATE	Apr 74
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; *Community Colleges; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Coordination; *Equal Education; *Financial Support; Higher Education; *Post Secondary Education; Student Personnel Services; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	*Michigan

ABSTRACT

Equality of access to postsecondary study in Michigan is discussed in terms of the establishment of a system of higher education that would provide equity in terms of: (1) individual selection and support services, (2) student financial assistance options, and (3) institutional and programmatic articulation. A synthesis of several major past efforts related to this issue is provided, and a series of recommendations whereby Michigan can enhance its efforts to alleviate this problem are made. Appendixes to the paper are: A. Full Text of the Report of the Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education; Background Information on Enrollment and Student Assistance; and Task Force Sub-Committee Reports: 1. The Role of State Government, 2. The Role of Institutions of Higher Learning, 3. The Role of the Community, and 4. The Role of the Student; B. Full listing of recommendations and membership of State Board Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education; and C. Text of the Report of the State Board Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education and minutes of State Board action taken on it. (DB)

ED 099017

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Equality of Access to Postsecondary Education

Michigan Department of Education

JC 740 458

Equality of access stands as one of the fundamental cornerstones of our society. Areas of life in which this ideal has not as yet been fully realized stand as grim reminders of the limitations of our past success and guideposts focusing our future efforts. Equality of access to post-secondary study is a crucial turning point in this ongoing effort, as such training itself often serves to enhance the participant's chances of successful participation in many aspects of life.

In light of the importance of this issue, equality of post-secondary access was singled out by the Michigan State Board of Education as one of the major problems warranting special concentration in our planning efforts. The attached staff issue paper represents a synthesis of several major past efforts to speak to this issue, and provides a series of recommendations whereby Michigan can enhance its efforts to alleviate this perplexing problem.

John W. Porter
Superintendent of Public Instruction

April, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
CHAPTER I — INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM	1
CHAPTER II — SELECTION AND SUPPORT	6
CHAPTER III — STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	10
CHAPTER IV — AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM	14
CHAPTER V — CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	17
APPENDICES	19, 37 & 43
A. Full Text of the Report of the Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education	20
BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON ENROLLMENT AND STUDENT ASSISTANCE	22
TASK FORCE SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS	26
I. The Role of State Government	26
II. The Role of Institutions of Higher Learning	30
III. The Role of the Community	33
IV. The Role of the Student	35
B. Full listing of recommendations and membership of State Board Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education	26
C. Text of the Report of the State Board Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education and minutes of State Board action taken on it	45

CHAPTER I

Introduction to the Problem

The fundamental issue of "access" pervades many aspects of American life. The citizen today is aggressive in many areas, claiming the right of participation and control over various aspects of his life which had previously been somewhat fatalistically abdicated to the structural agencies and organizations of society. This concern has been vocally depicted of late in terms of the civil rights movement, student activism, individual rights legislation, consumer protection movement, etc.

Willingham summarizes this essential problem of the articulation of personal and societal priorities succintly as follows:

> . . . how to nurture the rare talents so badly needed by society while, at the same time, giving all individuals equal rights and a fair distribution of privilege. No social system has solved this riddle satisfactorily, but the main shortcoming of a democratic free enterprise is the devastating effectiveness with which competition brings some to the top and leaves too many at an unacceptable bottom.
>
> The suggested answer is that society must be so organized that all individuals have unfiltered and continuous opportunity to pursue their interests and utilize their individual talents.[1]

Post-secondary education plays a crucial role in the overall spectrum of this complex "access" concern; for in a highly credentialized society such as ours, higher education has come to be viewed as the very vehicle through which full access to a wide panorama of societal arenas can be gained. Thus, access to post-secondary study has legitimately come to be viewed as a central focal point for much of the present concern over the "access" issue.

Historically, this focus has given rise to numerous broad national statements of public concern regarding the necessity of expanding access to post-secondary study. As early as 1947 the Truman Commission concluded that:

> The time has come to make education through the 14th grade available in the same way that high school education is now available.[2]

Similar sentiments have subsequently been expressed repeatedly by various national panels, and the concept of access to post-secondary study options has actually been expanded to what is known as "Universal Access".[3]

As Crossland concludes:

> America has been committed, in principle, to universal access to higher education for some time.[4]

However, a vast difference still persists between the ideal and the real, and it is with this glaring discrepancy that we must seek to deal effectively. The literature is repleat with statistical evidence regarding the discrepancies which do currently exist in terms of access to post-secondary study; there is little need to dwell at length upon the documentation issue at this juncture. Some of the more compelling evidence in this regard can, however, be summarized briefly as follows:

1. In terms of racial/ethnic enrollments, Michigan statistics indicate that minorities are clearly underrepresented at Michigan Colleges and Universities.

	Full Time Michigan Undergraduate Enrollment Fall, 1970	Overall State Population Distribution[5] 1970
White	92.3%	88.7%
Non White	7.7%	11.3%

2. Similar data can be drawn in terms of racial/ethnic enrollments for the national population.

1. Willingham, Warren W., *Free-Access Higher Education*, CEEB, New York, 1970, p. 1.

2. Truman Commission Report, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Dept. of H.E.W., 1947.

3. See for example:
   a. Eisenhower Commission Report, *Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice Hall, 1960.
   b. "Educational Policies Commission Report", *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School*, Washington, D.C. N.E.A., 1964.
   c. "Carnegie Commission Report", *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education*, N.Y. McGraw-Hill, 1968.
   d. ————, *Federal Aid to Higher Education: An Essential Investment In The Nation's Future*, Berkeley, CA, The Commission, 1968.
   e. ————, "A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda For Equal Opportunity In Higher Education", N.Y., McGraw-Hill, 1970.

4. Crossland, F.E. *Minority Access to College*, N.Y., Schosken Books, 1971, p. vii.

5. "Summary of Racial-Ethnic Enrollments in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, 1970.", M.D.E., Lansing, MI, 1971.

	National Higher Education Enrollment 1970	National Population[6] Distribution 1970
White	93.2%	85.0%
Non White	6.8%	15.0%

3. In terms of socio-economic factors, on the other hand, the data indicates that a family with an annual income of over $15,000 and one or more college age children is *five times* more likely to include a full-time college student than is a similar family with an income of under $3,000.[7] Also, it can be noted in similar fashion that 95% of high ability youth from high income homes enter college within 5 years of high school completion, whereas only 50% of equally high ability but low income youths so enter.[8]

The reasons that underlie such aggravating roadblocks which continue to stand in the path of open access to post-secondary study are myriad and extremely complex. However, upon evaluation, it becomes apparent that the major reasons involved fall into constellations which contain both organizational and personal parameters. The following discussion will attempt to briefly identify some of these major problem areas or constellations in an effort to set the stage for the subsequent chapters which will develop recommendations geared toward their alleviation.

One of the first major problem constellations which immediately appears is that of the traditional selection process itself. Institutionally speaking, most post-secondary schools have traditionally utilized a highly competitive student selection procedure which relies heavily upon high school grade point average and standardized test results. This procedure, of course, oftentimes eliminates many urban and rural youths who have come from weak secondary programs which have not rigorously prepared them in terms of traditional academic yardsticks. Since no widely accepted alternative yardstick exists, there presently is no adequate method to assess the potential of students who fall in this category. Thus many students are possibly penalized each year simply because the selection process which opens the door to post-secondary study, is defective.

In this regard, Crossland suggests that more research be undertaken in an attempt to expand the arsenal of "nonintellective" selection factors,[9] and a recent Carnegie Commission Report suggests that access by the atypical student be expedited by altering our perception of institutional status from the test scores of entrants to the measured "value added" through the institutional training itself.[10]

A second major problem constellation centers around the issue of cost. Educational expenses have been rising in the past decade at an alarming rate; thus often placing post-secondary education beyond the reach of lower socio-economic students. This inflationary cycle thus proves to be another explicit form of discrimination affecting students of all racial/ethnic groups. As a recent article in *U.S. News and World Report* emphasized:

> Higher education is passing out of reach for millions of . . . American families . . . (since) . . . at present prices . . . a fourth to a half of an average family's income (would be) needed to pay one child's expenses at most colleges . . .[11]

Yet a third area of major concern covers the area of institutional planning and coordination. To date, institutional and programmatic development has all too often developed capriciously according to political whim and individual fancy, with no strong centralized coordination and guidance. This haphazard process has often left students great geographical distances from appropriate programs and/or even the nearest post-secondary institution itself. This factor in itself can often serve as a form of discrimination for the students involved, since for them the possibility of access has often been made too remote to pursue. As Willingham states:

> Proximity has become a key element in the accessibility of higher education for several reasons. The most important considerations are related to the connection between proximity and opportunity. It is reasonably assumed that a nearby college is more likely to prove attractive (especially) to a marginal student because of its intangible identity for him, its familiarity, and its relevance to his interests.[12]

Studies by Bashaw[13] and Trent and Medsker[14] support this contention that proximity tends to influence attendance patterns.

With respect to this question Glenny concludes that:

> Which way are we heading in post-secondary education? The most realistic answer points toward increased centralization of planning at the state level. This new direction seems both logical and necessary if we are to respond effectively to expressions of current preferences and in-

6. Crossland, F.E., *op cit.*, p. 10-18.
Note, similar data can also be obtained from:
Egerton, J. *State Universities & Black Americans*, Atlanta, Southern Education Foundation, 1969.

7. Botton, R. E., "The Economics and Public Financing of Higher Education: An Overview," in *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1969, p. 62-63.

8. Berles, R. H., "Higher Education Opportunity and Achievement in the United States" in *"The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1969, p. 150.
(See also:)
a. Creager, et al., "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen—Fall, 1968", *ACE Research Reports*, Vol. 3, no. 1, 1968.
b. "Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education", CEEB, N.Y., 1973, p. 10-28.

9. Crossland, *op. cit.*, p. 84-89.

10. *Continuities and Discontinuities: Higher Education and the Schools*, as abstracted in the 4/27/73 *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. 7, No. 41, p. 1.

11. "Can You Afford College?", *U.S. News and World Report*, Vol. 70, No. 8, 2/22/71, p. 25.

12. Willingham, *op. cit.*, p. 9-10.

13. Bashaw, W.L. "The Effect of Community Junior Colleges on the Proportion of the Local Population Who Seek Higher Education", *The Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 58, No. 7, 1965, p. 327-329.

14. Trent and Medsker, *The Influence of Different Types of Public Higher Institutions on College Attendance From Varying Socioeconomic and Ability Levels*, Berkeley, CA, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1965.

dications of future demands by college students and society.[15]

A fourth and final major constellation of problems deals with the very nature of traditional, institutional programs and attitudes. Established programs of post-secondary study have been formulated in large measure around the traditional competitive motifs which presuppose that entering students will be adequately prepared for the rigors of the classroom. These programs have also been fashioned along traditional disciplinary models which may be entirely foreign and irrelevant to the perceived needs and desires of many students, particularly those from minority backgrounds. Finally, this somewhat rigid structural matrix has also dictated the types of information prepared and disseminated by our various institutions of post-secondary study. This data if often confusing to the atypical student who has not received large doses of prior indoctrination in the formal logic of academic routine. Furthermore, this information can often be criticized as being more institutionally oriented than student oriented.

Looking at this problem from the student's perspective, we run afoul of a wide range of problems which must be dealt with. Related concerns over adequate academic preparation, level of student motivation, perceived program relevance, and adequacy of current communication efforts can be identified here.

The concern over deficiencies in secondary academic credentials relates directly to both the student selection process mentioned above and the student retention process in focus here. This problem will continue to persist as more and more atypical students find their way to the campus. This is exactly the chart plotted for the future of post-secondary study according to the Carnegie Commission's recent study which is cited above, so we must conclude that more emphasis must be laid on creative research in both admissions criteria and specialized remedial programs if both the quality and scope of post-secondary study are to be maintained.

The related factor of personal motivation also becomes important here. As Crossland states:

> The importance of motivation in determining the likelihood of admission to (and retention in) college varies in relation to the other factors described above. The less the 'native ability', the longer and more assiduously the student must study. The smaller the family financial resources, the harder the student must work, save, and sacrifice. The poorer the quality of the high school from which he comes, the more the student must seek extramural aid, inspiration, and cultural stimulation.[16]

Every effort must be made to stimulate a high degree of motivation on the part of atypical students if their full potential for post-secondary study is to be realized.

Closely related to this point, of course, are the concerns pertaining to program structure and the informational materials disseminated in conjunction with them. If the student cannot identify a program that is even remotely of interest or if he received unintelligible or incomplete information regarding program options and/or services available, full utilization of that person's potential for further study and growth is not likely to be realized.

As Willingham concludes:

> If the idea of equal opportunity for higher education has any teeth to it at all, one must assume that a free-access college should offer enough curriculum choice to attract a wide variety of students . . . (likewise) since social and political forces provide much of the impetus for what is and is not done in extending educational opportunities, relevant information in the public domain can have an important bearing on legislative and administrative decisions that determine the accessibility of higher institutions.[17]

This brief discussion regarding some of the major reasons for the current imbalance in post-secondary attendance can be summarized in outline fashion as follows:

Major Problem Constellations

Institutional Parameter	*Personal Parameter*
1. Traditional standardized test-score and grade-point average related admissions criteria.	1. The deficient secondary experience of many disadvantaged students.
2. Escalating cost of post-secondary study.	2. Insufficient resources available to disadvantaged students.
3. Lack of coordination in institutional construction and development.	3. The excessive distance to appropriate schools and/or programs.
4. Traditional academic track system and articulation methodologies with secondary institutions.	4. Inadequate academic preparation, lack of motivation and incentive, lack of perceived program relevance, and confusion over information available.

While the problems at hand are admittedly complex and more extensive than the relatively simple matrix shown above, this procedure does enable the reader to focus upon some of the major problems which presently precipitate the current inequities in access to post-secondary study and it can serve as a roadmap to the subsequent discussion and recommendations for action which will be made later in this paper.

The results of the present lack of uniformity in access to post-secondary education are clear. Individual mobility is stifled and the poverty cycle of the disadvantaged remains unbroken. This engenders

15. Glenny, L.A. "Comprehensive Planning for Higher Education: Focus on New Priorities", as reproduced in *Public Affairs Report*, Berkeley, CA, Vol. 14, No. 1, 2/73.

16. Crossland, F.E., *op. cit.*, p. 72.

17. Willingham, *op. cit.*, p. 213-214.

hostility and alienation on the part of the citizenry and robs our society of the social, cultural, intellectual, and economic contributions so desperately needed from the entire population if a fully functioning democracy is to survive.

The State of Michigan and its State Board of Education have not been silent on this issue of access to post-secondary study. In recent years, the following four groups, for example, have, in varying degrees addressed the issue of access.

I. On May 27, 1970, Governor William G. Milliken established a Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. The charge to the Task Force was as follows:

A. "To determine present enrollment patterns at all community colleges, colleges and universities in Michigan.

B. To review admissions and scholarship programs at all our public institutions of higher education.

C. To review the recent events at the University of Michigan, and similar events elsewhere, to see what can be learned from them.

D. To consider, evaluate, and recommend to me, as soon as possible, suggested programs for increasing minority enrollment in higher education, providing needed assistance to members of minority groups, and promoting the cause of equal justice for all."

In his letter to potential Task Force participants, the Governor stated that he did not believe that enrollment and study opportunities at colleges and universities of Michigan (as well as the country as a whole) had been as available as they should be to minority group students: therefore, he wished to establish the Task Force to see how Michigan could improve its service to such persons.[18]

The Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education concluded its work in a final report to the Governor dated September 10, 1970.

II. Similarly the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education was created by the State Board of Education on July 14, 1970. The charge to the Committee was stated as follows:

A. "To advise the State Board of Education on means for providing greater equality of opportunity in higher education in Michigan."

B. "Within the scope of its broad charge, it is hoped that the committee will consider in some detail the following important issues, which are identified in the goals of the State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan.

1. admissions policies and practices among Michigan institutions of higher education,
2. improved financial aids programs for low-income youth,
3. the role of the community college as an open-door institution,
4. the problem of community college transfers to baccalaureate institutions,
5. student fees and tuition charges,
6. means for identifying and encouraging qualified high school graduates to continue education; and
7. equal opportunities issues in the provision of student residence halls and student facilities, and in other aspects of student life on campus."[19]

The Ad Hoc Committee concluded its efforts in a final report to the State Board on March 9, 1971.

Similar themes were engendered by the recommendations set forth in the final reports of the Governor's Task Force and the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee of the State Board. Basic to both reports were the following general conclusions and recommendations.

A. Black, Chicano, and American Indian students are under-represented in institutions of higher education.

B. State government should reaffirm its commitment to equality of opportunity.

C. That changes be effected in the Michigan Competitive Scholarship Program and the Michigan Tuition Grant Program so that an increasing number and percentage of awards will go to minority students.

D. That information systems be developed to inform minorities of available programs and assistance.

E. That the State budget process include consideration for meeting the needs of minority students.

F. That institutions be encouraged to meet the special social and educational needs of "emerging groups," and that institutional incentives be provided.

G. That the state provide financial support for special programs to meet the needs of minority students.

H. That the State assume an increasing responsibility for the support of community colleges on an equitable basis.

I. That a community college be established within commuting distance of every populace area within the state.

J. That all institutions formulate and make public plans for increasing their minority enrollments.

K. That Black, Chicano, and American Indian or "Tri-Ethnic Minorities" be employed in signfi-

18. Letter of charge, Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, May, 1970; as reiterated on p. 1 of the formal Task Force Report, September 10, 1970.

19. Report to the State Board of Education by the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education, Lansing, Michigan March 9, 1971.

cant numbers, and responsible positions in institutions of higher education.[20]

III. At its meeting of October 10-11, 1972, the State Board of Education appointed a Task Force on Equality of Access to Higher Education in Michigan. The charge to the Task Force was to assist in the development of specific proposals for the implementation of the recommendations in the report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education, with appropriate recognition of the reactions listed in the summaries attached to the report. The Task Force held its initial meeting October 30, and concluded its activities June 30, 1973, with a final report to the State Board. In this final report, the Task Force presented specific proposals to facilitate equality of access to higher education. Included are:

A. Proposals calling for certain studies by the State Board.

B. Proposals pertaining to the recruitment of Black, Chicano, and Native American students.

C. Proposals pertaining to access to post-secondary programs regardless of geography or previous training.

D. Proposals pertaining to needed changes within the institution.

E. Proposals for policies to be established by the Legislature, pertaining to support for institutions.

F. Proposals for changes in existing and for new financial aid programs.

IV. The State Board of Education also appointed, at its meeting of October 10-11, 1972 a Board Subcommittee to develop proposals to provide greater equal educational opportunity in higher education, considering the omnibus higher education legislation, private trade and technical schools, and other related matters. A Subcommittee Report on Equality of Access was subsequently presented to the State Board at its meeting of December 20, 1972. The resolutions of this Subcommittee which were supported by the State Board were as follows:

A "That the State Board of Education request the Superintendent to develop a report to examine the effects of providing either tuition-free or low-cost education in the public community and junior colleges and implementation plans for submission to the State Board of Education.

B. That the State Board of Education request the Superintendent to prepare a report for the Board evaluating the advisability of establishing an Associate in Technical Studies Degree to be awarded by the trade and technical schools and request the Superintendent to develop specific proposals to implement this recommendation."[21]

The foregoing discussion indicates that attention has periodically been given to inequality of opportunity in higher education in Michigan by both the Governor's Office and the State Board of Education. Activities to date have been based upon the basic premise that disadvantaged students have often been effectively excluded from participation in higher education, and that certain procedures must be adopted to rectify this situation. These procedures would lead to the establishment of a system of higher education that would provide equity in terms of:

1. Individual selection and support services
2. Student financial assistance options
3. Institutional and programmatic articulation

The following chapters of this report will discuss these components which must be developed in order to operationally provide true equality of access for higher education in Michigan.

20. The eleven items outlined here represent an editorial condensation of the total recommendations found in both reports. The reader is referred to the original documents for comprehensive recommendation listings. The Governor's Task Force Report has been attached in its entirety in Appendix A and a complete listing of the State Board Ad Hoc Advisory Committee's recommendations and membership is found in Appendix B.

21. Abstract of the minutes of the State Board of Education Meeting of December 20, 1972; State Board of Education Memorandum, December 26, 1972. See Appendix C for the Subcommittee Report and minutes of State Board Action taken on it.

CHAPTER II

Selection and Support

If Michigan is to move to a more egalitarian society, universal access to post-secondary educational opportunities is a must. In order for this ideal to be attained, Willingham suggests that higher education will have to possess at least the following three characteristics:

1. "It must be relatively inexpensive so that cost does not arbitrarily exclude those who cannot pay or are unwilling to burden an uncertain future with a long term debt
2. It must be willing to admit (and educate appropriately) the majority of high school graduates if that is what universal opportunity is to mean
3. It must exist in such proximity that neither geographical nor psychological distance constitute a major barrier."[1]

This chapter will focus on the second of these premises, whereas chapters 3 and 4 will deal with the concepts of cost and coordination respectively.

In order to overcome present inequities adequate educational services must be provided for "those groups" not traditionally served in large numbers by our institutions of higher education. Success in the attainment of this goal will be contingent upon the development of appropriate procedures for the (a) selection, (b) recruitment, and (c) support of atypical students.[2]

The traditional views of institutions of higher education are reflected in the existing criteria for the selection of students. These criteria include high school achievement, quality of school attended, influential recommendations, and standardized test scores. These traditional admissions predictors have, in many instances, served to deny access to higher education to various categories of atypical students, whose backgrounds have not prepared them along lines of these academic yardsticks. To help insure that *all* students receive a fair and impartial evaluation of their potential in this regard, new and more reliable techniques for assessing the talents of such persons are needed.

The State Board's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access earlier suggested in this regard that:

A. "The State Board of Education should assume a major share of the responsibility for the identification of students for higher education in Michigan"

and that

B. "The State of Michigan should provide national leadership in securing a revision of technique used for the identification of pupil talents and abilities."[3]

In clarifying this second point, the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee went on to add that:

> The Committee urges consideration of recent findings (*Righting the Balance*, CEEB, 1970) that current, commonly used examinations fail to recognize and uncover a wide variety of student talents, skills, and mental attributes. Many potential college students are thereby penalized. We urge that the state assume leadership in the development of identification procedures not limited to verbal and mathematical ability, but incorporating many other dimensions of individual potential.[4]

The more recent State Board Task Force on Equality of Access to Higher Education supported the intent of this original proposal, and went on to recommend the following procedures to implement this goal:

A. "Development of an assessment form to be included in a student's permanent school file, identifying qualities of a potential post-secondary candidate. Such a form should include measurement of:
   1. Personal Qualities
   2. Social Qualities
   3. Other strengths and skills
B. Exploration and development of a talent-assessment instrument to measure other dimensions of talent potential."[5]

In elaboration of this structure, the Task Force indicates that implementation should further include:

> Development of a permanent form to assess talents and strengths not identified on test results (which) should be

1. Willingham, Warren W., "Free-Access Colleges: Where They Are and Whom They Serve," *CBR*, No. 76, Summer, 1970, p. 6.

2. Per prior discussion in this paper and the recent Carnegie Commission Report cited earlier, our reference to "atypical students" can be categorically defined as those individuals who due to age, sex, race, geographical location, socioeconomic status, or deficient K-12 education background do not readily find access into post-secondary study.

3. Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education, *State Board Report*, pp. 9 & 10, Recommendations 2 & 4.

4. *Ibid*, p. 10.

5. Task Force on Equality of Access to Higher Education, *Final Report*, August, 1973, p. 8.

undertaken by the Department of Education. This form would then be a required part of a student's public school file to be used for recruitment or counseling purposes.

On a long-term basis, investigation of a talent assessment instrument should also be undertaken. This assessment would ideally be conducted periodically throughout a student's school years. Information gained through this assessment would be used not only in recruitment efforts but also in enhancing the schools' curriculum to foster such talent development.[6]

Staff concurs with the concepts and priorities set forth in these task force reports, and would add a further recommendation in this regard as a mechanism to operationalize the considerations at hand.

Recommendation One

"We recommend that the State Board establish a staff study team in conjunction with Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (MACRAO), charged with the responsibility of thoroughly investigating current efforts in the field of non-traditional admissions predictors and reporting back to the Board with policy recommendations in this area."

In light of the crucial nature of the situation, however, staff would also make the following additional recommendation for immediate action:

Recommendation Two

"That State Board as a matter of policy formally designate that all community colleges follow a policy of "open admissions" whereby any adult person, with or without a high school diploma who wishes to enter may do so." (This recommendation was adopted with the understanding that it be interpreted in terms of overall institutional entry, not entry to specific academic programs which might still legitimately maintain reasonable academic qualification requirements.)

It is realized that most Michigan Community Colleges have already implicitly adopted this stance. This recommendation is offered to reinforce those institutions which have made this move and to insure that all implement this policy in a consistent manner.

Intermeshed with the concern over actual identification of pupil talents lies the equally perplexing question of institutional recruitment procedures themselves. Traditionally, institutions have operated individually in open competition for "qualified" students. This system exposes institutions to the rigors of the open marketplace in searching for students, but it concurrently subjects students to the implicit self-interest of the institution in the recruitment process. As we are finding today in many sectors of the economy, society is no longer willing or able to bear the latter in an attempt to perpetuate the former. The problem concerning access here seems to lie in the fact that this process tends to precipitate institutional concentration on the relative political priorities of the day which leads to unequal concentration upon access for different focal groups, instead of focusing uniform concentration upon equality of access for all. For example, much institutional effort is expended annually recruiting top academic students, athletes, students with special talents (music, etc.), racial-ethnic minorities, women, etc. This emphasis upon categorical recruitment invariably leads both to undue competition pressures on some students and the near neglect of others.

This process also, of course, raises concern over the inherent inefficiency found in such a system wherein each school is actually duplicating the effort of other institutions in recruiting any specific individual student. The entire process appears to be in need of a more humane orientation.

Upon reviewing this situation, the State Board Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access to Higher Education concluded that:

> Problems in recruitment appear to be related to the historically competitive nature of American higher education, a competition for certain kinds of students not for their sake, but for the institution's . . . Recruitment in higher education too often has been a mixture of obsolescent ideas and continuing mythology . . . Recruitment has been handled as if education were a commodity to be sold to customers.[7]

The Ad Hoc Advisory Committee went on to recommend specifically that:

> A statewide recruitment system should be established to match the needs, potential abilities, and desires of prospective college students with the characteristics—real and desired—of our existing institutions.[8]

The subsequent Task Force of the State Board supported this concept and went on to recommend several procedures geared toward the implementation of a centralized application review and processing service which would prepare and distribute uniform application forms as well as actually match applicants and institutions for entry considerations.[9]

The 1973-74 Annual Program Plan for the Department of Education's, Student Financial Assistance Service's Information Services Unit, which was recently approved by the State Board, however, recommends that:

> The State Board support the creation of a study committee charged with the responsibility of evaluating both the feasibility and desirability of creation of a centralized and computerized admissions and recruitment service within the information services unit of Student Financial Assistance Services.
>
> This committee would subsequently be asked to aid in the formulation of pertinent policies for implementation if the project is deemed appropriate.[10]

Staff concurs with this final suggestion as such changes in the fundamental fabric of post-secondary

6. *Ibid.*

7. State Board Ad Hoc Advisory Committee Report, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.
8. *Ibid*, p. 13.
9. *Op. cit.*, p. 12.
10. 1973-74 APP, Financial Assistance Service's Information Services Unit, September 4, 1973, p. 7.

study should not be made without full evaluation of the ramifications involved.

Yet another concern pertaining to the actual admissions process is the role which students themselves should rightfully play in either the admission decision itself or the concomitant recruiting process.

The State Board Ad Hoc Committee on Access recommended in this regard that:

> The State Board of Education should encourage Michigan Colleges and Universities to make it possible for their students to participate in the admissions process.[11]

They elaborated on this rather general statement by saying that:

> Students . . . should be voting members of admissions committees; should be encouraged to help with recruiting efforts; and should, in fact, play a role in recruiting new students comparable to that played by faculty members in recruiting new faculty.[12]

The subsequent State Board Task Force on Access built on this position and made some specific suggestions regarding involvement of students in admission interview procedures and active field recruiting. It was suggested by this group that such action could be implemented ". . . through a State Department of Education directive to admission offices of all post-secondary institutions."[13]

Staff feels that a more cautious plan of action should best be followed in this regard, to insure that student participants are both fully prepared for their roles in this regard and able to accomplish these activities without sacrificing their own academic programs. Therefore, it might be wise to charge the "study team" identified in Recommendation One with the development of a responsible policy of a student participation which would include at least consideration to (a) student training, (b) confidentiality of records, (c) student reimbursement and (d) a mechanism for evaluation. This policy could then be submitted for State Board review and communication to schools once developed and approved.

The institution's responsibility to the so-called atypical or educationally disadvantaged student does not end once that student has enrolled. To the contrary, it has just begun. Every post-secondary institution that admits such students has an obligation to provide those students with the maximum opportunity to succeed. This, by no means, implies that academic standards should be lowered. Rather, the student must be coached where necessary, to the level of existing standards. Thus, it is necessary to provide the academic and social/cultural support services needed to enable such students to have a maximum chance to succeed. Such services will take the form of tutorial assistance, academic, personal, and vocational guidance, as well as appropriate psychological services.

In this regard, the State Board's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Access has formally recommended in the past:

1. "That the State of Michigan establish a program which will fund institutions for supportive services to disadvantaged students.
2. That Special Assistance Programs should be established with state grants on a project basis to institutions of higher education for: (a) the development of new instructional and curricular strategies for the education of students from minority groups, and (b) programs to promote an understanding and acceptance of minority students by faculty, students, and the community."[14]

The Committee elaborates on the importance of this point by stating that:

> Patterns of institutional racism, of irrelevant curricula, of unaware faculties, of rigid doctrinaire administrators—must be altered if equal access is to become equal educational opportunity. The state can become a catalyst for such change through the provision of special grants to institutions who are willing to attempt change.[15]

The subsequent State Board Task Force again supported these notions and recommended that support services efforts be made an integral part of the State funding formula and create a statewide commission charged with the ongoing review of efforts and priorities in this area.[16]

The concept of support services is truly a complex issue. Included therein must be concurrent efforts aimed at (a) the provision of impetus for the generation and development of creative and effective support mechanisms themselves, (b) the development of adequate evaluation and feedback mechanisms designed to assess the degree of success attained, and (c) the development of adequate funding sources to support and enhance this priority.

To assist institutions in this very important process, staff recommends that:

Recommendation Three

"The State Board seek to compile information regarding various institutional support methodologies and their cost and relative success, so that these procedures can be systematically shared with all Michigan institutions in hopes that such shared experience can facilitate successful support program development."

In conclusion, it must also be stated that any success achieved in humanizing activities related to the identification, recruitment, and support of atypical students will be at least initially viewed by many traditional academicians as an erosion of the quality of post-secondary study. Much recent academic debate has been directed towards the supposed threat to academic standards which might result from the adoption of

11. Ad Hoc Advisory Committee Report, *op. cit.*, p. 16, (rec. 9).
12. *Ibid.*
13. Task Force Report, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
14. State Board Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-23.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
16. *Op. cit.*, pp. 24 & 29.

more flexible and open admissions and retention policies to enhance the equality of access.

Astin concludes in this regard that:

> . . . much of the controversy about open admissions and special programs for disadvantaged students has been unproductive because the adversaries have tended to talk past each other. Whereas the proponents of open admissions typically speak of the need for equalizing educational opportunities . . . the opponents usually speak of the need for maintaining academic standards and for conserving our dwindling institutional resources.[17]

Attacking this defensive, traditional argument from a somewhat different perspective the recent Carnegie Report cited earlier *(Continuities and Discontinuities: Higher Education and The Schools)* admonishes the educational community to change its priorities from measuring the entering student product as the "academic coin of the realm" to evaluating progress in terms of the "value added" by the training experience itself. This shift in priorities would be much more supportive of present access concerns.

It is assumed that excellence and access will not prove to be contradictory premises if they can be combined in an innovative and creative educational setting.

Yet another factor related to the present student selection and support concern is the information which is made available to the student concerning these options. Adequate admissions criteria and procedures can be established and successful support programs made available; but if these options and facilities are not adequately communicated to the potential student populations involved, they may prove to be largely ineffective in terms of having an impact on the intended population. This concern is particularly germaine to the atypical student, whose motivation in terms of exploring and pursuing alternatives may be less powerful than other students.

17. Astin, A. "Open Admissions and Programs for the Disadvantaged," *J.H.E.*, Vol. 42, No. 8, November 1971, p. 629.

To help deal with this concern staff makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation Four

"It is recommended that the State Board of Education seek funding to support an admissions and financial aid information unit within the Student Financial Assistance Services section. This unit would be charged specifically with the following responsibilities:

1. Development and distribution of comprehensive information regarding admissions policies and procedures as well as program offerings and costs at all Michigan schools.
2. Development and distribution of comprehensive information regarding financial aid resources which might be available to Michigan students from the federal, state, and private arenas.
3. Design and implementation of research efforts designed to continuously assess both the current student needs in the above areas and the relative impact of current efforts in these areas."

In summary, this chapter has attempted to deal briefly with the issue of student selection and support as it impacts upon the question of access to post-secondary study. In this area we have confronted the important issues of (a) admissions criteria themselves, (b) institutional recruitment procedures, (c) institutional support services for atypical students, and (d) the information services activity which must be developed if we are to successfully communicate these efforts to our clientele and stay abreast of their changing needs.

In addition to these concerns, however, we must also deal with problems related to financial aid per se and the interinstitutional articulation so necessary if the attack on access problems is to be carried forth in an efficient and effective manner on a statewide basis. Chapters 3 and 4, respectively, deal with these remaining topics.

CHAPTER III

Student Financial Assistance

The financial aids question thus must be viewed as an integral part of the whole "access" issue. Even if the problems of preparation, admission and program support are dealt with, many will still be barred from full participation on the basis of insufficient funds, if care is not taken to insure that adequate student resources are available.

The relation of the economic status of the family and the likelihood of college attendance is borne out in Chapter I. Simply stated, the less money the family has, the less likely the children are to attend college.

The present student aid picture is extremely complex, as a variety of resources are now available from the federal, institutional and private sectors, as well as through the state. In light of increased concern over the access issue, and mushrooming consumer demand, the great majority of these programs have established demonstrated financial need as a prime consideration for award eligibility.

Given this basic statement of focus, however, one must now go on to explore the questions of (1) whether or not sufficient student aid now exists to meet the demand for increased access, and (2) whether current aid programs are effectively distributing funds to enhance the goal of increased access.

In reviewing this first question regarding the overall quantitative sufficiency of current student aid efforts, it becomes apparent that while the magnitude of these programs and the dollars expended to date are certainly extensive, the best information available still indicates that they yet fall far short of the goal of guaranteed access for all able Michigan students wishing to pursue their studies beyond high school. For example, from the tripartite applications recently filed by Michigan colleges and universities with the U.S. Office of Education, in request of federal student aid monies for the 1973-74 school year; we find that some eighty million dollars in unmet need was estimated for the present 1972-73 academic year after expected family input, institutional aid, state student aid, and private philanthropic aid was subtracted. If the approximately forty million dollars in federal student aid assistance that was available in Michigan were subtracted that year, there exists roughly forty million dollars of unmet need for the 1972-73 academic year.

This computed deficit can be further compounded when one looks at the following additional facts:

A. These figures do not include reference to part-time and vocational school students; most of whom until very recently have been eliminated from award consideration under most programs.

B. These figures include no estimate of the need of Michigan students either choosing to pursue their post-secondary training outside of the state, or forced to do so because Michigan does not currently offer an appropriate program in their area of interest and ability. As population mobility continues to increase, the number of such students will doubtlessly continue to grow.

C. The present federal programs—National Direct Student Loans (NDSL), Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), College Work Study (CWS)—are currently in a state of flux, and may soon be substantially supplanted by the new Basic Opportunity Grant concept, as favored by the present administration. The full effect of such a dramatic change is yet unknown because the proposed Basic Grant Program (BGP) eligibility criteria and funding level are still uncertain.

D. The above figures include no estimate of the added demand for resources which would be felt if the post-secondary milieu were to be substantively changed by adding to the present mix a significantly greater percentage of high need, disadvantaged students. There has been, of late, substantial support for this very contention, indicating that if post-secondary education does continue to grow, the increase will come directly from these lower socio-economic circles. A recent Study of Financial Aid Programs and Needs for the state of Florida, for example, has contended that higher income families are already sending just about all of their students on for further training, who could possibly benefit from such exposure. Thus,

increased enrollment will draw proportionately greater numbers from the ranks of those in need, placing even greater strain on existing student aid resources.

E. The figures above will constantly grow in the future unless dramatic action is taken, due simply to the inflationary spiral of present educational costs.

To help cope with this dollar deficit, the State Board has initiated legislation proposing a general need-based Michigan Opportunity Grant Program to provide awards for Michigan students. Legislation pertaining to this proposal has been periodically introduced in past years without success, but it has again been introduced and is being considered during the current legislative session.

The State Board has also initiated legislation proposing a Direct State Student Loan Program whereby students who are unable to secure a guaranteed loan through a private lending agency would be able to apply for such assistance directly through the State of Michigan. Again, legislation pertaining to this recommendation has periodically been introduced in past years without success. A new bill covering this proposal has, however, been placed before the current legislative session.

In addition to this question regarding the relative adequacy of the overall quantity of aid currently available to needy students, we must also attempt to deal with the issue of distribution of current resources. Are existing funds, limited as they might be, supporting the goal of access or could they be better utilized in this regard?

This brings us to an increasingly controversial issue. The concept of "financial need" will always remain a relative one, since each individual has unique attitudes regarding the adequacy of his or her current standard of living and the rank order of spending priorities within that system. Uniform and objective "need analysis", on the other hand, requires that certain rather static assumptions be made regarding both the level and priority system involved. Even though great care is taken to base such systems on current Bureau of Labor Statistics information on spending patterns, etc., very few individuals will identify entirely with such a normative process. Thus, in dealing with this area, one must both (a) be ready to encounter a certain amount of hostility and (b) be constantly alert to methodological refinements, etc., which might make the arduous process more equitable.

While this paper is not designed to debate the relative soundness of current financial needs assessment approaches, we must look at some of the pertinent results of the prevailing systems to see how they fare against the yardstick of "access."

One such bench mark might well be an evaluation of the relative family income levels of student aid recipients. According to the 1970 Census Data, the average household income in the United States is approximately $11,000, so this figure will be used as a guideline.

Looking at the present State Competitive Scholarship and Tuition Grant Programs in this manner, the following chart can be constructed:

Percentage of 1972-73 Awards Made to Students from:	Competitive Scholarships	Tuition Grants
A. Families with incomes below $11,000	51.7%	55.5%
B. Families with incomes above $11,000	48.3%	44.5%

The data here shows that both state programs distribute their current resources somewhat equally around this mean income figure. The real question remains, however, could more emphasis be placed upon getting funds to the neediest students who may not now even be considering further training and applying for aid.

Another barometer of this phenomenon is a measure of the relative percentage of tri-ethnic minority group students receiving aid consideration under the present state scholarship and grant programs; since a high correlation between socio-economic disadvantaged and minority background consistently persists:

STATE COMPETITIVE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM & TUITION GRANT PROGRAM

	% of White Award Winners	% of Non-White Award Winners	% of Race Not Reported
1972-73	83.7%	6.9%	9.4%
1971-72	90.0%	6.0%	4.0%
1970-71	90.3%	5.7%	4.0%
1969-70	*	*	*
1968-69	*	*	*

*No such data collected

Reviewing this parameter, we see that some headway has been made in opening the established state scholarship and grant programs to a previously largely excluded group.

While comparable data is very difficult to find in the federal, institutional and private philanthropic arenas, since most such aid is administered through the college or university's respective financial aids office; some feel for the overall award picture at that level could be obtained by again looking at overall state student financial aid applicant enrollment in terms of income range. Again, utilizing the Federal Tri-Partite[1] applications in this regard, we find that the institutions themselves identify the prospective socio-economic enrollments of aid applicants for this period as follows:

1. From Federal Tri-Partite applications forms filed annually by each college and university in Michigan with the U.S.O.E. in request of federally sponsored student aid funds.

1972-73 Full-time Undergraduate Aid Applicant Michigan Enrollments by Family Income

	$0 to $6,000	$6,000 to $9,000	$9,000 to $12,000	Over $12,000	Total
Community Colleges	17%	29%	19%	35%	100%
Four-Year Public	11%	16%	18%	55%	100%
Private	14%	22%	21%	43%	100%

1973-74 Full-time Undergraduate Aid Applicant Michigan Enrollments by Family Income

	$0 to $6,000	$6,000 to $9,000	$9,000 to $12,000	Over $12,000	Family Income Unknown	Total
Community Colleges	19%	21%	23%	24%	13%	100%
Four-Year Public	12%	15%	18%	45%	10%	100%
Private	14%	17%	22%	41%	6%	100%

We see from this data that some progress is being made in terms of increased enrollment percentages from lower socio-economic level groups. It can be assumed that current student aid programs are at least in part facilitating this progress.

In terms of actual national award allocations for specific federal programs, the following charts can be prepared:

1972-73 Academic Year[2]
National Program Totals

	Guaranteed Loan Program	National Direct Student Loan Program	College Work-Study Prgoram	Educational Opportunity Grant Program
National Percentage Awards to "Non-White" Students	21.2%	20.8%	26.3%	37.0%
National Percentage Awards to Students of Families with Income Under $9,000	45.8%	74.0%	82.7%	95.8%

2. National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education, April 26, 1973.

Similarly, on a cumulative state-wide basis, the following summary of Michigan Guaranteed Loan recipients could be made:

Profile of Michigan Borrowers[3]
Receiving Guaranteed Student Loans
11/8/65 - 6/30/72

Percent of Non-White Loan Recipients	10.8%
Percent of Recipients With Gross Income of Under $9,000	36.5%

While the data available here is somewhat soft, the time periods between national and state data are not uniform, and program changes may have somewhat directed the results; in looking at the cumulative statewide data through June 30, 1972 and the national data for the 1972-73 school year, some progress can be identified in terms of focusing the Guaranteed Loan program more clearly on the access target. The national data also demonstrates that on an average, some 25% of all 3 Federal Aid Programs' student awards are presently going to non-white applicants. It also indicates that while some 50% of GSL funds are going to low-income families, earning below $9,000 in gross income, the direct federal NDSL, CWS, and EOG programs, administered directly through the college financial aids office, make some 80% of their awards to this target low-income group. When one adds in the institutional and philanthropic aid also distributed through the various school student aid offices, however, the above percentages would probably be somewhat reduced, as most of these funds do not operate under the strict income ceiling factors levied by legislation on these federal resources. As we have seen in the preceding state level student aid statistics, "demonstrated need" alone without these accompanying income ceilings tends to spread the student aid more evenly around the median income factor.

Finally, drawing on other data from the 10/69 and 10/71 *Current Population Reports* (U.S. Department of Commerce)[4], we find also that the overall percentage of minority adults in the 18-24 age range who have had no college training has steadily decreased over the last several years:

3. Report from Federal Guaranteed Loan form 1070 data, prepared by Reports and Data Analysis Section, Payment Services Branch, Division of Insured Loans, USOE, Washington, D.C. September, 1972.

4. 10/69 and 10/71 *Current Population Reports* (U.S. Department of Commerce) Washington, D.C.

	1971	1970	1969	1968	1967
Percentage of Non-White Population with No College Experience	66%	*	83%	84%	85%
Percentage of White Population with No College Experience	54%	*	61%	65%	65%

*Data not available

Given this brief picture of the student financial aid scene, it would appear that action is needed in at least the following two areas in this regard if the cause of access is to be advanced:

1. Development of the total dollar amount of assistance available to Michigan students.
2. Review of the general delivery system employed in the distribution of these funds to insure their support of the overall goal of enhanced student access.

In terms of dollar quantity of aid available, staff would make the following recommendations:

Recommendation Five

"It is recommended that the State Board continue its support of current pending legislation for the Michigan Opportunity Grant and Direct State Student Loan Programs."

These programs will begin to speak to the dollar deficit of student aid which presently exists within the State.

Recommendation Six

"That the public community and junior colleges and those public baccalaureate institutions which currently provide community college functions establish some form of student financial aid so that no student would be denied access to the first two years of college-level instruction for lack of adequate financial resources."

A combination of enhanced student assistance at the community college level and implementation of the Opportunity Grant and Direct State Loan Programs should go a long way towards amending the dollar deficit which now exists in student funding in Michigan.

In terms of reviewing the present student aid delivery system and its alternatives, a study is now under way in conjunction with the Department's Student Financial Assistance Service Area and the Bureau of Management and Budget which should speak to this area. Studied evaluative comments concerning this aspect of the student aid scene will undoubtedly be forthcoming from this arena.

In summary, careful attention to both the question of overall dollar deficit itself and the companion question of delivery system policy should help deal with the problem of student assistance as it pertains to our concern regarding the access issue.

CHAPTER IV
An Integrated System

Much of the discussion undertaken to this juncture has revolved around either developments which can be accomplished individually by Michigan post-secondary institutions, or comprehensively by the State Board and Department of Education. However, much of the success of any concentrated effort to enhance the equality of access in Michigan will depend upon the support and participation of the collective post-secondary community in the state. There are several major elements which make up this vast post-secondary system in Michigan. Besides the public community and baccalaureate institutions there are private colleges and universities, proprietary schools of various types, and various area training centers. It is apparent that all of these facets in Michigan's post-secondary system have a valuable and important role to play—a role that is worthy of preservation. The students of the state, quite apart from any financial consideration, have a wide variety of interests, desires, talents and capabilities. It is, therefore, important to maintain a system of as great diversity as possible so that each person desirous of post-secondary education and training can find a program and an institution that meets his or her particular interests and abilities.

It is recognized that many of our institutions of post-secondary study have already engaged in extensive efforts to admit and support various types of atypical or disadvantaged students. These individual efforts are certainly to be commended and supported; but if maximum efficiency and effectiveness are to accompany these efforts, they must be carried on in a coordinated matrix which both supports and guides existing efforts and challenges non-participating institutions to enter this arena. It is believed that each institutional element in Michigan's post-secondary system should have both a concern for and an operational policy for the alleviation of access problems.

In this regard the State Board's Task Force on Equality of Access has concluded that a statewide articulation commission made up of representatives of all portions of the post-secondary arena should be created to address this issue.[1] Staff would emphasize the need for development of some mechanism which can help provide a forum and vehicle for the facilitation of the development of a truly integrated post-secondary system in Michigan.

An integrated system implies, in fact demands, that each sector's activities support and articulate with those of the others. This crucial task of coordination in terms of the access issue addressed in this paper, must determine the needs of our citizenry that are currently not being met by our post-secondary network and then determine what role each institutional segment could best play in rectifying the situation.

Once an operational framework is in order, there are several controversial procedural or policy areas which staff feel should be addressed by this mechanism, as they obviously impact directly upon the issue of student access. These concerns can be outlined briefly as follows:

I. The matter of community college districting.
   A. The State Board's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equality of Access spoke to this issue in two of its final recommendations as follows:
      1. "Since a 'self-identification' of students for higher education will occur if college opportunities are made more accessible, the State should insure that all geographic regions and centers of population in Michigan are served by community colleges."[2]
      2. "It is recommended that the State assume greater responsibility for an equalization of opportunities for entrance into and completion of programs of study in higher education, through the expanded provision of training mechanisms in areas of the State with large tri-ethnic minority and geographically disadvantaged populations."[3]
   B. The subsequent State Board Task Force on Equality of Access further recommended that:
      1. "The State Board of Education conduct a carefully structured study for the purpose of identifying future trends and needs

1. State Board Task Force, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

2. Original Committee Recommendation # 5.
3. Original Committee Recommendation # 18.

of the post-secondary population in the state."

2. "The State Board of Education consider the development of a plan that would provide flexible districting by post-secondary educational opportunities. Such a plan would emphasize transferability of credit, would incorporate the importance of transportation to and living arrangements at the location of given programs and would recognize that not all programs need to be or should be permanent."[4]

C. Concerning existing plans for such redistricting the Task Force commented that:

> ". . . the 1967 and 1971 State Plans for community college districting are already old and conversely, the pending legislative bills, designed last year, are outdated.
>
> It is the position of this subcommittee that the State Board of Education use its influence to delay the implementation of any major plan for redistricting until a thorough study can be conducted examining future population shifts and compositions, cultural, social, economic and industrial potential, as well as leisure time and recreational trends coupled with transportation and instructional technological predictions."[5]

Staff agrees and would emphasize that immediate steps must be taken to alleviate the present districting gaps which exist if the cause of equality of access is to be comprehensively advanced in Michigan. Open admissions and free tuition, as recommended earlier, mean little if appropriate districting is not also provided.

II. The matter of external degree programs.

Providing student opportunity to obtain credit outside of the clasroom, and opportunity to receive recognition for pertinent "real world" experience offers yet another mechanism whereby access barriers can be lowered. Not only do such systems reduce overall post-secondary costs and time and distance factors, but they also emphasize that the post-secondary system can effectively relate to the factors of experiential significance in the individual's life. The meshing of academic curricula and experiential priorities is a necessary prerequisite if program relevancy is to be communicated to any student, but this premise is particularly germane to the typical student who may be somewhat disillusioned by the post-secondary structure at the outset.

Here again, however, statewide planning and coordination is needed, if the external degree concept is to be equitably and rationally utilized to serve the best interests of both Michigan students and society at large.

Recognizing the importance of prudent policy development in this area, the State Board's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Access initially recommend that:

> The State Board of Education should explore possibilities for the establishment of an 'external degree program' in Michigan.[6]

The subsequent State Board Task Force on Equality of Access does not take a further position on this recommendation, indicating that "The Coordinating Council of Continuing Education is working on this in cooperation with the council of Graduate Deans."[7]

Staff actually sees the external degree concept as part of a much larger construct (namely the whole realm of atypical study options) which is developing so rapidly today. This construct would, for example, include the arena of lifelong education, etc. If the State Board of Education is to serve in a definitive leadership capacity in this controversial area, every effort must be made not only to research the developments in progress, but also to use this information as the springboard for creative thinking and planning in this regard. Basically, the question to be addressed here is simply how can this new concept be utilized to forward the cause of access in post-secondary study in Michigan?

With this thought in mind efforts should be made to thoroughly evaluate the possible development of these options in light of the impact that they might have regarding the overall question of access.

III. Yet another related area needing investigation and planning concerning its potential impact upon the question of access is the Associate of Technical Studies Degree. Such a provision could possibly serve to coordinate the now largely undisciplined technical training programs, and facilitate their consideration in terms of the transferability question, etc. The State Board Subcommittee recommended in this regard that:

> . . . the State Board of Education approve the establishment of an Associate of Technical Studies Degree to be awarded by the trade and technical schools and request that the Superintendent develop specific proposals to implement this recommendation.[8]

Subsequently the State Board's Task Force on Equality of Access took the creation of such a degree as given and urged that:

> . . . the State Board of Education move rapidly to establish a high degree of flexibility in the requirements

4. Task Force Report, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
6. Original Recommendation #19.
7. Task Force Report, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
8. Minutes, 12/20/72, State Board Meeting.

for the award by both private and public post-secondary insitutions of both one-year and two-year technical degrees.'

While it is realized that many other planning and coordination issues could be raised here, it is hoped that by expressing this basic concern over the matter and identifying some of the key issues afoot, that the procedure can be energized and activated so that other pertinent considerations will automatically find their way into the evaluative structure. Much of the ultimate success of this planning and coordination venture will, of course, depend upon both the creativity and initiative of the people involved.

9. Task Force Report, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Recommendations

America is a country of great contradictions. It is a country of great promise founded upon great principles. To promise 200 million people freedom and equal opportunity appears to be part of a dream of utopian proportions. However, to call the dream utopian, as if it were an impossible goal, is to admit to failure. And, for many individuals in this country, it is to assign them to less freedom and less opportunity than that enjoyed by others. To not strive to reach a just and equitable system is to deny the worth of these goals as practicable and by default to support injustice and the lack of equity.

It has been long believed and is well supported that education is the access road to greater opportunity within this society. Education not only bears fruit unto itself, but general and/or specific training is, in most cases, requisite for employability. In spite of the wealth of this country, there remain those who lack the financial vehicle to travel this educational road of access. In many cases, for these people, the promise of this land becomes empty as poverty limits their opportunity and locks them securely into life styles and patterns that serve only to perpetuate themselves. It, therefore, becomes apparent that improved access to education for those now denied it is necessary to fulfill in part the promise of equality held out to all.

It would be joyous to report that Michigan does not share these problems. But, it is a large state that shares the complex problems of society with the rest of the country. Limited access to higher education is one of these problems. This is, by itself, a large and complicated problem. In summary, it would be impossible to deal with the total scope of the problem.

It is felt, however, that the following recommendations can provide the framework from which to attack the problem and some of the means to do so. The recommendations are reiterated here in the order originally presented, identifying the various problem aspects involved in this paper's overall attack:

I. Admissions and Support Factors:

A. Admissions Criteria:

Recommendation One: We recommend that the State Board establish a staff study team in conjunction with Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (MACRAO), charged with the responsibility of thoroughly investigating current efforts in the field of non-traditional admissions predictors and reporting back to the Board with policy recommendations in this area.

Recommendation Two: That the State Board as a matter of policy formally designate that all community colleges follow a policy of "open admissions" whereby any adult person, with or without a high school diploma who wishes to enter may do. (This recommendation was adopted with the understanding that it be interpreted in terms of overall institutional entry, not entry to specific academic programs which might still legitimately maintain reasonable academic qualification requirements.)

B. Admissions Recruiting Practices:

No formal recommendations are offered here, but a summary of prior statements for action are identified in Chapter II.

C. Student Support Services:

Recommendation Three: The State Board seek to compile information regarding various institutional support methodologies and their cost and relative success, so that these procedures can be systematically shared with all Michigan institutions in hopes that such shared experience can facilitate successful program development.

D. Information Services:

Recommendation Four: It is recommended that the State Board of Education seek funding to support an admissions and financial aid information unit within the Student Financial Assistance Services section. This unit would be charged specifically with the following responsibilities:

1. Development and distribution of comprehensive information regarding admissions policies and procedures as well as program offerings and costs at all Michigan schools.

2. Development and distribution of comprehensive information regarding financial aid resources which might be available to Michigan students from the federal, state and private arenas.

3. Design and implementation of research efforts designed to continuously assess both the current student needs in the above areas and the relative impact of current efforts in these areas.

II. Student Financial Aid:

A. Dollar Deficit Presently Existing:

Recommendation Five: It is recommended that the State Board continue its support of current pending legislation for the Michigan Opportunity Grant and Direct State Student Loan Programs.

Recommendation Six: That the public community and junior colleges and those public baccalaureate institutions which currently provide community college functions establish some form of student financial aid so that no student would be denied access to the first two years of college-level instruction for lack of adequate financial resources.

B. Delivery System:

No formal recommendations are offered here in lieu of the research that is presently under way in this area, as identified in Chapter III.

III. System Coordination:

No further formal recommendations are offered here, but State Board is asked to comprehensively review the emphases and prior recommendations covered in this regard in Chapter IV.

Some of these recommendations and comments call for immediate action, some for long range study and consideration. Some are somewhat general, grandiose and vague, while others are more detailed and specific. These differences may be a source of frustration to some who will perceive the less action oriented statements and recommendations as "copouts." Yet assuredly this is not the case. All of these considerations, if vigorously pursued should result in positive action dealing with the access problem. Some such action called for here is operational while other is primarily developmental in nature, but this is to be expected in light of the largely uncharted area with which we are dealing. Research and consensus must be the forerunners of action in such situations if public resources are to be responsibly utilized. Yet, the full commitment to action is here if we choose to support it.

APPENDIX A

September 10, 1970

FINAL REPORT

The Honorable William G. Milliken
Governor
The State of Michigan
State Capitol Building
Lansing, Michigan 48903

Dear Governor Milliken:

We are transmitting herewith the final report of the Special Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education which was established on May 27, 1970.

We believe that the report speaks for itself and that therefore, there is very little that we can add to it. We do want you to know, however, that in our opinion the members of the Task Force as well as its staff did an excellent job. As a result of extremely good cooperation of all members of the group we were able to pull together what we believe are realistic and useful recommendations in all the areas covered by the report.

We appreciate your interest in and commitment to the cause of equal opportunity for all persons. We hope that the Task Force report will be of use to you as you continue to strive to assure such equal opportunity. We certainly have a long way to go before this goal becomes a reality, but we know that with the leadership of persons such as yourself, Michigan will continue to approach that goal.

We believe that you and other officials of State government are truly committed to equal opportunity. We also believe that the administrators of Michigan's institutions of higher education have such a commitment. What is lacking, we believe, is a coordinating mechanism whereby State government and educational institutions can work cooperatively to that end. Therefore, we would suggest that you consider the establishment of a new mechanism (such as a Joint Liaison Committee), through which you, the Legislature, the Department of Education and the institutions of higher education can all work cooperatively to develop and implement programs to assure greater opportunity for all, as well as programs to improve the quality of education.

The Task Force, as it points out in its report, was not able to answer all of the questions implicit in your Charge to it. The shortness of time, and our mutual desire for quick progress, prevented us from looking at some of the problems that contribute to the lack of equal opportunity. The members of the Task Force believe that it would be useful for such subjects (which are mentioned in the report) to be considered by another similar group in the near future with more time at its disposal.

With the transmittal of this report the Task Force believes that it has fulfilled the Charge given to them by you.

We plan no further activities unless you should make additional requests of us. We have enjoyed the opportunity to work in this area for you and we hope that you feel that the Task Force has made a useful contribution.

Sincerely,

William T. Patrick, Jr.
Co-Chairman

Dan Smith
Co-Chairman

Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity In Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Appointment:

The special Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education was established by Governor William G. Milliken, on May 27, 1970. Membership on the Task Force included:

William T. Patrick, President—New Detroit, Incorporated

Dan Smith, Vice-President & General Manager—Michigan Bell Telephone Company
(Co-Chairmen)

Dr. Dewey Barich, Mr. Ozell Bonds, Mr. Noah Brown, Dr. John Chavis, Mr. Dwight Havens, Dr. James W. Miller, Mrs. Ola Nonen, Dr. John Porter, the Honorable William Ryan, Mr. George Welch, Mrs. Martha Wylie and the Honorable Charles Zollar.

Charge:

In his letter asking the above to serve as members of the Task Force, the Governor outlined his purpose in establishing the group: He said, in effect, that he did not believe that enrollment and study opportunities at the colleges and universities of Michigan (as well as the country as a whole) had been as available as they should be to minority group students: therefore, he was establishing the Task Force to see how Michigan could improve its service to such persons. In his letter of invitation the Governor also said:

> Certainly, decisions on enrollments and admissions properly belong to the governing boards of institutions of higher learning. Yet I believe that State government has a responsibility, indeed an obligation, to assist such institutions, as well as to protect and advance the rights of all our citizens.
>
> Accordingly, I have decided to establish a special Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. I am asking that Task Force to accept several responsibilities.
>
> 1). To determine present enrollment patterns at all community colleges, colleges and universities in Michigan.
>
> 2). To review admissions and scholarship programs at all our public institutions of higher education.
>
> 3). To review the recent events at the University of Michigan, and similar events elsewhere, to see what can be learned from them.
>
> 4). To consider, evaluate, and recommend to me as soon as possible, suggested programs for increasing minority enrollment in higher education, providing needed assistance to members of minority groups, and promoting the cause of equal justice for all.

The Governor also said "I know that minority groups do not have equal access to higher education. I also know that crisis demands and confrontations always result in a hardening of public opinion on both sides of such issues. I believe that a group such as the one outlined above can help substantially."

At the initial meeting of the Task Force, in the Governor's office on May 27, 1970, the Governor repeated the above charge to the Task Force, and then went on to add certain specifics:

1). The function of the Task Force is advisory. They are to make recommendations to the Governor in two distinct areas:

   a). Recommendations as to possible courses of action which lie within the authority of the Governor, e.g., *changes* which the Governor could suggest to the Legislature regarding State scholarship programs, *new programs* which the Governor could present to the Legislature at the next session, *financial matters* and *priorities* which the Governor could include in his next budget, etc.

   b). Recommendations which the Governor in turn could pass on to the colleges and universities of Michigan concerning admission policies, special tutorial programs, special recruiting efforts, etc."

The Governor stressed the fact that in this particular area the power to *decide* lies with the colleges and universities; but he said that he was confident that recommendations coming from the Task Force, and himself, will receive favorable consideration by the institutions of higher education.

Schedule:

The Governor added that the Task Force should determine its own schedule, but said that he was very hopeful that the Task Force could present to him either a status report, or, preferably, a final report by September 1, 1970.* This date was chosen so that the Governor could include the recommendations of the Task Force in his budget and program planning, and so that he could also pass on the Task Force's recommendations to Michigan colleges and universities, before the Fall semester begins.

He added that the Task Force should be "as bold, as innovative, and as imaginative as possible." They should, said the Governor, recognize "that the State is bound by the framework of reality—that funds are limited, that institutions change slowly, etc.—but even while recognizing these limiting factors," the Governor said, "the Task Force should not feel excessively constrained by them."

Finally the Governor emphasized that the Task Force should recognize that its assignment was "nonpartisan." The only purpose of the group was to advance the cause of equal opportunity. The Governor pledged that he would do nothing to make political capital out of the Task Force's activities, and he added that he expected the members of the Task Force to take the same approach.

Procedure:

The Task Force thus has had approximately three months to conduct and complete its deliberations. It has held many meetings as a whole, and it has divided into sub-committees which have held separate meetings. Members of the Task Force (either collectively or in small groups) have met with university administrators, with students, and with representatives of the various constituencies involved in its Charge. Thus, the separate charges given to the Task Force have been handled on occasion by separate sub-groups; but the final report is that of the total Task Force.

At an early meeting the Task Force decided that the Charge given to it was so broad, and the time made available to it for its procedures was so limited, that it would virtually be impossible for the group to work on every subject as a group. Therefore, the group decided to break its assignment down into separate fields, and to organize the Task Force sub-committees, with each sub-committee taking a particular assignment. Four sub-committees were established.

1). The Role of the State,

2). The Role of the Institutions of Higher Education,

3). The Role of the Community, and

4). The Role of Students.

The Task Force delegated the basic assignment of information collection and organization to staff. That part of the Task Force assignment is contained in the introductory remarks; the remainder of the report represents the work of Task Force members.

Campus Unrest—A Special Problem:

As the Task Force proceeded, it was plagued by a problem which was most difficult to solve. The assignment given to the group by the Governor was directed largely at the question of equal opportunity in higher education. Yet that question had arisen, in part, because of recent instances of campus unrest. The Task Force believed that incidents of campus unrest make it most difficult for disadvantaged and minority group students to secure equal opportunity. Accordingly, the Task Force decided that it must consider the subject of campus unrest. At the same time, the Task Force recognized that this problem is so broad and so comprehensive, with so many groups looking at and examining the problem, that there seemed to be little practical utility in the Task Force concentrating much attention in this area. Accordingly, in the report of the Task Force the subject of campus unrest is discussed, but only to the extent that it properly relates to the Charge to promote equal opportunity.

This has presented some difficulties within the Task Force itself, as the same subject has presented difficulties within the United States as a whole. Some members of the Task Force believed that the group should look closely and comprehensively at conditions in colleges and universities generally, and in a sense, evaluate them as institutions of higher education; others believed that the only legitimate purpose for the Task Force was to examine the institutions of higher education as their functioning affects the achievement of equal opportunity.

We have not been able to solve this question completely; therefore, there are elements on both approaches in the following report.

The Task Force unanimously, however, wishes to go on record as stating its belief that a major part of the solution to the problems of campus unrest, as well as a major part of the establishment of the condition of equal opportunity, is the full discharge of the responsibility which the institutions of higher education themselves possess. Members of the Task Force believe that a major cause of campus unrest has been the attitude of college and university administrators toward students. Frequently, such administrations appear to

*Staff presented a status report to the Governor on August 20, 1970, indicating that the final report would be delivered to the Governor by September 15, 1970, at the latest.

believe that all student grievances are without foundation. The Task Force recognizes that, on occasion, such grievances may be magnified, even substantially exaggerated. We also believe, however, that in most such instances students do have legitimate complaints, and we therefore would recommend that such administrations consider student complaints and grievances with a more open mind and with a willingness to concede that the legitimate grievances do exist. Some members of the Task Force feel that American universities are too resistant to change, too reluctant to adapt to modern needs. Other members of the Task Force would put the idea differently. Yet all agree that the universities, colleges, and community colleges of this State (as well as other States) do have a substantial challenge confronting them.* The Task Force was told by college students, as well as by others who have talked closely with college students, that a major problem confronting the college student today is the rigidity and the lack of sensitivity present on too many American campuses. We have been told that such conditions present difficulties even for the student who comes from the high socio-economic background. The student who comes from a disadvantaged background is sometimes paralyzed by such conditions. Therefore the Task Force recommends strongly that every institution of higher education in this State should begin and continue a process of continual self-examination and self-renewal. Is the functioning of the institution really in the interest of the students, and designed to contribute to their ability to fit into American society, or is the institution functioning largely out of habit, and because of what has been done in the past? Questions like these are difficult to answer. Yet we firmly believe that the answer to questions like these will largely determine the future of life on American campuses in the decades ahead.

*This challenge is not easily met. On June 15, 1970, the Task Force met in separate sessions with President Robben Fleming and other members of the University of Michigan administration, and representatives of the Black Action Movement. (A staff transcript of these meetings is included in the official Task Force report submitted to the Governor.) The Task Force was made aware that although an agreement had been reached, there remains a serious lack of understanding, confidence, and trust between the administration and the students. Similar discussions with officials and students of other colleges and universities indicate that this unfortunate condition may exist at all institutions of higher education in Michigan.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON ENROLLMENT AND STUDENT ASSISTANCE

Overall Enrollment:

More than 400,000 students will be attending Michigan's 93 institutions of higher education during the coming 1970-71 school year. This means that one out of every three Michigan residents between the ages of 17 and 24 will be enrolled in a degree-granting institution this Fall.

Enrollment in Michigan's colleges and universities has been increasing extremely rapidly in recent years. For example, in 1965 total enrollment in Michigan's colleges and universities was 271,000 students. This year the total enrollment is estimated at 408,000 students. This constitutes an increase in higher education enrollment of 137,000 students or 50.6% in Michigan in only five years.

In addition, while total enrollment has been increasing rapidly, the enrollment mix between public four-year colleges, private colleges, and community colleges has been changing drastically. The major shift in this changing enrollment mix has been the increasing importance of the community colleges as providers of higher education services and a lessening of dependence on the public four-year colleges and private colleges. This shift is illustrated in Table I below.

TABLE I

	Total Enrollment	Four-Year Public Colleges	Private Colleges	Community Colleges
1970	408,000	217,000	53,000	138,000
1965	271,000	167,000	47,000	57,000
	+ 137,000	+ 50,000	+ 6,000	+ 81,000
	+ 50.6%	+ 29.9%	+ 12.8%	+ 142.1%

Because of these trends, higher education in Michigan has become big business with total operating budgets for Michigan's 93 degree-granting institutions in the neighborhood of $1 billion dollars per year. Furthermore, State support for higher education in Michigan has also been increasing rapidly with total State support approaching $400 million annually. The vast bulk of this State support (approximately 85%), goes to the 13 four-year public colleges. Public support for the State's community colleges is shared between local property tax support and State financial support. At present, less than *40%* of the community college budgets are derived from State revenues.

Minority Group Enrollment:

Despite these impressive growth figures, many qualified young people in Michigan, particularly those of minority backgrounds, still will not be attending Michigan's degree-granting colleges and universities this fall. For example, while non-white youths account for nearly *10%* of the State's college age population between the ages of 17 and 24, they are expected to account for only about *5½%* of the State's college enrollment in 1970-71. As a result, less than 30,000 of Michigan's expected student enrollment of 408,000 will be minority group students. Thus, less than one out of every four college age youths from minority group backgrounds will be attending college this year.

The reasons for this disparity are many and varied. The disparity is the result of a host of educational and other inequalities. Consequently, there is no single, simple solution. While many qualified young people in Michigan are denied the benefits of a higher education solely because of insufficient financial resources, money alone will not be enough to insure equal opportunity in higher education. Increased financial assistance for needy students is required, but a variety of other supportive services and institutional changes are also required. The recommendations in this report address themselves to both the financial question as well as detailing the many other changes that are required to insure equal educational opportunity.

With the continuing demands on our rapidly-changing, complex, technological society for more and better educated workers, the existence of educational inequality is not only a hardship to the individuals involved, but also works against the best interests of the entire society as well. While higher education is not the only path to a more productive occupation and a higher income for our young people today, it is the primary road that most of them must travel.

There were approximately 2,400,000 students in Michigan's elementary and secondary schools in 1969-70. Of these, *86%* were white, *12%* were Black, and nearly *2%* were of Spanish-speaking, American Indian or Oriental backgrounds. In addition, Michigan's high schools graduated 131,000 students this year. Approximately 8,500 or *6.5%* of these high school graduates were Black and 800 or *.6%* were of either Oriental, American Indian, or Spanish-speaking backgrounds.

Nearly half or, 64,000, of these recent high school graduates have indicated that they intend to pursue a higher education this fall. This includes approximately 4,100 Black students and nearly 400 students of other minority backgrounds. It is questionable whether all of these ambitions will be realized. It is particularly questionable for the minority group students since most of them are starting out with a number of severe handicaps.

First, most minority group students come from socio-economically deprived homes with annual family incomes substantially below that of most white college students. Thus, the financial requirements associated with a higher education constitute a formidable barrier for many of these young people since they can expect little or no financial support from their families. In addition, most parents of minority group college freshmen have less than an 8th grade education. Consequently, the family social and cultural support that is available to most college freshmen, is non-existent for these students.

Secondly, many minority group students graduate from inferior inner-city high schools. These schools have inferior academic standards and inadequate resources in comparison with other secondary schools in the State. Thus, the students from these schools are often ill-prepared to compete at the college level with the students from more affluent schools and backgrounds. They are often not only socio-economically disadvantaged but educationally disadvantaged as well. With these handicaps, it is surprising that as many do aspire and succeed in their efforts to obtain a higher education.

Unfortunately, many of these disadvantaged students who do start college do not succeed in completing their education. The college drop-out rate for Blacks is twice the rate for white students. The reasons for this include financial difficulties, inadequate academic preparation, and social adjustment problems. It is obvious that if equal educational opportunity for all is to become a reality in Michigan, we will have to place greater emphasis on both the recruitment and retention of our disadvantaged students.

There is a wide diversity of response from the State's 13 public four-year colleges, 29 community colleges, and 51 private colleges in terms of serving the needs of our minority group student body. The enrollment of non-white and disadvantaged students is not evenly spread among these 93 institutions. Instead, this enrollment is heavily concentrated in only a few schools. For example, two schools—Wayne State University and Highland Park Junior College account for nearly *43%* of the State's total Black student enrollment and only five schools—Wayne State University, Highland Park Junior College, The University of Detroit, Michigan Lutheran College, and Eastern Michigan University, account for better than *60%* of the State's total Black enrollment. Interestingly, while Black students constitute nearly *10%* of the total student body among our community colleges, they make up less than *5%* of the student body in our four-year public colleges and our private colleges.

Furthermore, not only are our Black students concentrated in a few of the State's 93 institutions of higher learning, but they are further concentrated in only a relatively few fields of study. While complete information is not available, it is evident that our Black and

other non-white students are over-represented in such traditional fields of study as teaching, nursing, and social work. Conversely, they are grossly underrepresented in such fields as engineering, business administration, and the physical and life sciences.

While most minority students attend colleges and universities located in major urban centers with a significant minority group population in the community, a fair number of minority students do attend colleges and universities in other and smaller communities that are almost exclusively white communities. As a result, the social adjustment and anxiety problems facing these minority group students (as evidenced by several confrontations in recent years) is even more severe than those faced by most minority group students.

Financial Support:

The majority of students attending Michigan's institutions of higher learning today require some financial assistance — either from their families or from outside sources. These outside sources of support, which are particularly important to the disadvantaged student, include the federal government, private scholarships and tuition grants, state scholarships and tuition grants, and student aid from the schools themselves. Better than one out of every three students enrolled in higher education in Michigan receive some financial assistance from the school that they attend.

The primary sources of student financial assistance from the State are the State Competitive Scholarship Program and the State Tuition Grant Program. These two programs in 1969-70 provided State aid to 24,500 students in the amount of $12,200,000. For the 1970-71 school year, an additional 4,000 competitive scholarships and 1,800 tuition grants have been awarded to in-coming freshmen. Despite the fact that a disproportionate share of the financially needy freshmen students are minority group students, less than *4%* of these State scholarships and only *12%* of the State tuition grants were awarded to students with minority group backgrounds. The distribution of these State scholarships and tuition grants by racial background is shown in Table II below.

TABLE II

Distribution of 1970-71 Freshmen Scholarships and Tuition Grants by Racial Background of Student

	SCHOLARSHIPS		TUITION GRANTS		TOTAL	
	No. of Students	%	No. of Students	%	No. of Students	%
American Indian	3	0.1	1	0.1	4	0.1
Black	37	0.9	147	8.2	184	3.1
Oriental	8	0.2	3	0.2	11	0.2
Spanish-American	6	0.1	15	0.8	21	0.4
White	3,895	96.3	1,578	88.3	5,473	93.8
Other	97	2.4	43	2.4	140	2.4
Total	4,046	100.0	1,787	100.0	5,833	100.0

Of the approximately 60,000 white college freshmen expected in Michigan's colleges and universities this fall, nearly 7% will be receiving scholarships and nearly *3%* will be receiving tuition grants from the State. Of the better than 4,000 Black college freshmen expected this fall, however, less than *1%* will be receiving State scholarships, while about *4%* will be receiving tuition grants. As an aside,while more than half of the 1970-71 freshman class in Michigan will be attending community colleges in the State, only *7%* of the freshmen scholarships were awarded to students planning to attend a community college. In addition, more than half of the scholarship awards went to students planning to attend just two schools — the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

Furthermore, since the average gross parental income of this year's freshman scholarship and tuition grant recipients is approximately $10,500 per year, it is evident that many of our State's neediest students are not participating in these grants. As the State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan states:

> An obvious and serious difficulty exists in that there is no aid program designed specifically for students from culturally and educationally deprived circumstances.

Additional Information and Further Study:

It was with this background information in mind that the Governor's Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education developed the recommendations detailed in this report. It should be pointed out that in many instances, the efforts of the Governor's Task Force to develop recommendations more fully were hampered because of the unavailability of additional detailed information relating to minority students. Some of the areas where additional information would have been useful include all types of student financial assistance by racial/ethnic background of student; class and curriculum of minority students by institution; adequacy of secondary education; in- and out-migration of all students and minority students; racial and ethnic background of college faculty and other university personnel; and recent changes in supportive services and other institutional arrangements designed to meet the needs of minority students.

Unless improvements in the collection and dissemination of relevant information regarding the role of minority group students in Michigan's higher education system is forthcoming, the ability to measure progress toward the goal of equal educational opportunity for all will be severely restricted.

In addition, the Task Force would like to point out that many important questions contained at least implicitly in its Charge could not be adequately handled by the group because of limitations of time. Questions concerning the extent of equal opportunity in education

before college, the opportunities (or lack thereof) for employment after college, inequities in education and employment opportunity for women, as well as the very broad question of who "should" receive a higher education, all these and other subjects require examination and positive action. We would urge that such questions be entrusted to another group with a greater amount of time.

The information contained in this section was compiled from the following sources:

1. *Report on the Distribution of State Scholarships and Tuition Grants*, Michigan Department of Education.
2. *Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education* (Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
3. *State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan*, Michigan Department of Education.
4. *Preliminary Analysis of the 1968-69 School Racial Census*, Michigan Department of Education.
5. *Statement by Alexander Heard*, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, (on completion of his mission as Special Advisor to the President, July 23, 1970).
6. *Survey of Post-Secondary Educational Plans of Michigan High School Graduates*, Michigan Department of Education.
7. *Vocational Preparation and Race in Michigan Higher Education*, Michigan Civil Rights Commission.
8. *Equal Opportunity in Higher Education*, Michigan Civil Rights Commission.
9. *Discussion of Possible Changes in State Competitive Scholarship Program*, Michigan Department of Education.
10. *Higher Education Aid for Minority Business*, U.S. Dept. of Commerce.
11. *Survey of Scholarship Assistance in Michigan Colleges and Universities*, Governor's Office for Urban Affairs.
12. *Detail of Current Operations of the Executive Budget*, Executive Office of the Governor.
13. *Unpublished Population Projections*, the University of Michigan.
14. *Conversations with various members of the Michigan Department of Education.*

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

TASK FORCE SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

I. *RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ROLE OF STATE GOVERNMENT IN ASSURING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

We believe that all citizens of Michigan have a stake in the assurance of equal opportunity in all fields of human endeavor, including higher education. Each person, each community, each educational institution has a significant contribution to make. Yet the role of the State, while limited, must be paramount, since State government has the power and resources to stimulate the total Michigan society to move forward.

We believe that State government is aware of this responsibility, as is demonstrated by the Governor's appointment of this Task Force on Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. The State has done much to promote this objective. Yet we believe that the State can and should do much more than at present. Accordingly we recommend:

A. That State government clearly and unequivocally reaffirm its commitment to equality of opportunity in all areas, including higher education.

We recognize that the Michigan Constitution of 1963 incorporates clearly the requirement that all persons are entitled to equal opportunity in all areas. The Michigan Civil Rights Commission, and other bodies, were established to assure such equal opportunity. Nevertheless, we have not as yet reached the point where equal opportunity is a fact. Accordingly, this Task Force recommends that the Governor (perhaps in his State-of-the-State Address next year) clearly remind the people of Michigan that all persons are entitled to equal opportunity, that he reaffirm State government's intention to assure such equal opportunity, and that he call on all people throughout the State, and all institutions, to do their part to assure such equality of opportunity through some appropriate device.

We recognize that cynics may contend that verbal commitments mean little. We disagree. We believe that such reaffirmations by the Governor and the Legislature will clearly put Michigan on record as insisting on equal opportunity, and that subsequent policies and programs will be thereby influenced.

B. That changes be effected in the Michigan Competitive Scholarship Program and the Michigan Tuition Grants Program so that an increasing number and percentage of the awards will go to the disadvantaged.

The Michigan Competitive Scholarship Program, and the Tuition Grant Program were both established to assist needy and worthy young people in securing access to higher education. Both programs are worthwhile. Yet both are established and administered in such a way that the disadvantaged student benefits little from them.

Available statistics reveal several significant facts:

1). Less than four percent of the freshman competitive scholarships go to minority group students such as Blacks, American Indians, or Mexican-Americans;[1]

2). A somewhat larger percentage (but still less than 12%) of the freshman tuition grants go to minority group students;[2]

3). The average gross parental income of students receiving competitive scholarships or tuition grants is around $10,500.00. Clearly, then, programs are not helping minority group students or disadvantaged students as they should.[3]

1. *Report on the Distribution of State Scholarships and Tuition Grants,* Michigan Department of Education.
2. Ibid.
3. Scholarship Coordinator, Michigan Department of Education.

We accordingly recommend:

1). That the criteria of eligibility be altered, to give greater consideration for those who are culturally, socially or economically disadvantaged.

2). That the criteria of eligibility be expanded to include recommendations based on student potential, rather than insisting solely on student performance in mass testing which may be socially or culturally biased.

3). That the Scholarship and Tuition Grant Programs be further expanded (that they be funded at a greater level) so as to provide opportunity for a regularly increasing number of students.

4). That the Governor and the Legislature direct the Department of Education to so administer the Michigan competitive scholarship program and the tuition grant program that in the academic year of 1971-72 a minimum of 10% of total awards be made to disadvantaged (minority group) students.

5). That both scholarship and tuition grants be made available to students on a full academic year basis, rather than on a semester basis. Many disadvantaged students find their initial enrollment period very difficult and at times have academic problems. The awarding of a scholarship or a tuition grant for a full academic year would lighten this unusual burden, without lowering standards overall.

6). That the Governor urge the Legislature to resist the temptation to threaten the withdrawal of public assistance from students who participate in campus unrest. Those found guilty, after due process, of violation of laws should certainly be punished according to law, but State aid programs should not be administered in coercive or punitive ways.

C. That special attempts be made to inform disadvantaged students and their parents of available programs and assistance and opportunity.

We do not believe that disadvantaged students are sufficiently aware of State programs of assistance for which they could qualify. To be sure, many disadvantaged students today neglect to apply for such programs, believing that they cannot qualify. Yet, we believe that there is often a lack of awareness on their part of the availability of such programs.

Changes such as those suggested immediately above will lead to greater success by disadvantaged students in seeking and securing State assistance. Yet we also believe that greater efforts must be made by State and educational officials to inform such students of programs which are available, as well as to encourage them to seek to qualify for such programs.

D. That the State budget process regarding higher education include special consideration for the needs of the disadvantaged.

We have found that few institutions of higher education are really seeking to promote equality of opportunity in all of its implications. At most, there is a natural tendency to be content with the enrollment of an increasing percentage of minority students. Yet enrollment alone cannot succeed for most minority students; other services and aids are vitally needed.

Therefore, we recommend to the Governor that when he issues his budget guidelines to the State's institutions of higher education, he include as priorities:

1). Increased enrollment of disadvantaged and minority group students.

2). Supportive services for such students including relevant, appropriate and personalized counseling, testing, recreational and leisure activities. Without appropriate supportive services, such students will too often "fail".

3). "In-service training" for teachers, counselors and administrators, to better prepare them to deal effectively with disadvantaged and minority group students.

E. That the Governor call to the attention of the institutions of higher education the particular housing needs of disadvantaged students; that he encourage the institutions of higher education to take special action to help meet these needs. We also recommend that the institutions of higher education should make special attempts to assist the disadvantaged student where necessary in securing part-time employment, either on or off campus.

We have found that one of the most acute problems facing disadvantaged students, particularly Black students, relates to housing. On-campus housing is of course available for such students. Yet, increasingly today there is a trend for an ever larger number of students, particularly after the completion of their first year, to seek off-campus housing. Such is frequently

not available to disadvantaged or minority group students, primarily because of community attitudes.

We believe that every institution of higher education should adopt a policy which will promote equal housing opportunity for all students. We have been told, for example, that some institutions have maintained a discriminatory list of housing availabilities. Such a practice is illegal. It must be halted.

We further believe that every institution of higher education should adopt a policy which will promote equal employment opportunity for all students. This is particularly important as many disadvantaged students are in need of part-time employment.

F. That special programs be developed for disadvantaged students and that the State provide financial support for such programs when developed.

The students from disadvantaged backgrounds cannot initially be expected to approach or perceive campus life from the same vantage point as those from higher socio-economic settings. The disadvantaged student has to maintain high standards and at the same time develop appropriate study skills to compensate for inadequate preparation. In addition, such students frequently suffer from real feelings of inadequacy and insecurity.

We believe this transitional period can be eased significantly and chances for success can be enhanced with an increase in the number of specific programs aimed at disadvantaged and minority group students. Such students will require special assistance for some time. Therefore, we believe that the State should encourage the universities and colleges of Michigan to develop and to conduct such special programs. In particular, we recommend the State of Michigan should consider the development of a State-sponsored Talent Search Program.

We believe that one of the problems that disadvantaged students at times have difficulty fitting into an existing educational environment relates to the particular character of the curriculum of such an institution. Accordingly, we recommend that the State encourage all of our institutions of higher education to develop relevant and appropriate courses in minority group history and culture, and to include such courses and such subjects where appropriate all through the curriculum. In particular we urge the State to remind every educational institution that it should make every effort to make certain that its courses are complete and that they include the contributions and the activities of all of the groups that have made America what it is today.

In this way, all students, whether they come from minority groups or majority groups, will better appreciate the historic and present contributions of minorities to the development of the American nation.

We also believe that all institutions of higher education should be encouraged to hold seminars and other programs designed to sensitize their faculties and administrations to the particular problems of disadvantaged students, to make them aware of the circumstances which have influenced the position of minority groups in America, and to encourage them to participate in the development of plans to promote academic achievement, especially concerning American Indian, Mexican-American, and Black students.

Many institutions of higher education are already making efforts in this regard.* Most such programs have come about as a result of private funding (foundation support). We believe that the State should support such programs financially since they are a part of equal educational opportunity.

G. That the right of dissent be protected, even while the process of education is assured.

Certainly one of the most volatile issues which is present on the campus today concerns the question of how far the right to dissent should be assured. Some contend that the right to dissent is absolute, and society has no authority to curb dissent under any circumstances. Others contend that the campus is not a natural environment, and that therefore students should be denied some of the rights that others out in the general society have. We believe that both of these extremes are incorrect.

Institutions of higher education are concerned with the pursuit of truth. And one of the characteristics of truth is that it is not always perceived by the majority of a given community. It is for this reason that the right of dissent is essential. We believe, therefore, that State government should do everything that it can to make certain that the right of dissent is protected. Such protection is especially necessary for the minority student who is often falsely accused of fomenting unrest through dissent.

*Descriptions of programs promoting equal opportunity in higher education at various colleges and universities throughout Michigan are contained as an appendix to the official document.

Because these students feel particularly threatened, State and university officials have a special responsibility to provide for their safety.

We also believe that that right must be exercised responsibly. Therefore we think that the State must also assure that the normal process of education is protected. What we are saying in effect is that government must be very careful that it does not allow the exercise of argument to destroy the educational environment or educational process; at the same time it must be careful to make certain that the necessity of protecting the educational process does not lead to the denial of the right of speech and the right to dissent. Certainly these two are difficult to reconcile, yet they can and must be reconciled.

H. That procedures be developed within each institution of higher education, and that the State level generally, to reduce campus unrest when it occurs, and to prevent it wherever possible.

We believe that recent instances of campus unrest have jeopardized the availability of equal opportunity in higher education. Unfortunately, such instances have been perceived by many people as having been fomented by the demands of Black students. While this has not always been the case, it has unfortunately always been perceived as such. Aside from the fact that campus unrest agitates the general society, it also therefore jeopardizes equal opportunity. Consequently, we would hope that such instances of unrest can be reduced and perhaps eliminated completely.

We believe that State government should urge every institution of higher education to make certain that it is able to provide and to utilize specific, carefully elaborated procedures which will prevent or reduce campus unrest. In many of the instances with which we are familiar, campus unrest has arisen from the fact that there was no normal channel of communication which worked. We believe that every institution should develop, and explain to its student body, procedures for facilitating communication between students and the administration, including appropriate and specific mechanisms whereby students can present problems, grievances and recommendations to administrators; in this way, much campus unrest could be prevented. We urge State government to take the lead in encouraging all institutions to develop such procedures.

Even where such procedures are developed, they will not always work effectively. Therefore we believe that the State should make certain that other processes are available to assist in such situations. The Michigan Civil Rights Commission, which is constitutionally directed to promote and protect equal rights for all has vast experience in resolving campus disturbances particularly where race is felt to be a factor. Institutions of higher education should be encouraged to call on the good offices of the Civil Rights Commission. In addition, the Department of Education has substantial experience in such matters. We are confident that it would be willing to extend its services to assist in such situations.

Further, we recommend that the Governor seriously consider the establishment of a Panel of Campus Mediators. Basically what this means is that the Governor would pull together a list of ten, fifteen, or twenty experienced mediators, possibly utilizing such resources as the American Association of Arbitrators, or local groups affiliated with A.A.A., such as The Center for Dispute Settlement in Detroit, and would announce that such mediators were available to assist both administration and student groups where communication had broken down. The State would not send such persons into a campus situation unless it was requested to do so, but if requested to do so it would be quite willing to make them available. We believe that the presence of such persons on campus in the early stages of confrontations could be quite useful, because they could apply the experience they have learned in other circumstances to bring the two sides together and make certain that progress is achieved. Naturally, we believe that State government should respect the independence and integrity of institutions of higher education, and therefore such mediators should not be sent in without the request and the support of the administration as well as the student body. We recognize that educational administrations will be reluctant to request mediation. It is, however, preferable to a request for police assistance, a request which has been necessary in too many instances in academic situations.

I. That the process of accreditation of colleges and universities be expanded to include consideration of the extent to which the institution truly seeks to provide equal opportunity for all persons.

All institutions of higher learning periodically undergo evaluation by accrediting agencies. Such accreditation usually includes consideration of the quality and training of the faculty,

of curriculum, of library and other supportive services. We believe that accrediting agencies should include in their evaluation the commitment which the institution has to equal opportunity. Under the Constitution of Michigan all State institutions must be so committed, however, we have found a variety of commitments. We believe it would be helpful if equal opportunity considerations were included in the procedures of such acccrediting institutions.

J. That the State program of Neighborhood Education Centers, presently being established, work closely with the institutions of higher education in Michigan to make certain that persons who complete training at Neighborhood Education Centers will be admissible to colleges and universities.

Governor Milliken proposed, and the Legislature enacted, an experimental program of Neighborhood Education Centers to work principally with young people who have "dropped out" of high school. This program is presently being established.

We recommend that the program work closely with representatives of community colleges, colleges and universities throughout Michigan to assure that young people who successfully complete the program at a Neighborhood Education Center will be accepted in an institution of higher education.

K. That the State assume an increasing responsibility for the support of community colleges and that this support be appropriated on a more equitable basis.

We have found that a large proportion of the disadvantaged students in Michigan who pursue education beyond the high school do so in community colleges. The reasons for this are very clear. Such institutions are located near the students' homes, the cost of attending them is much smaller than is the case with an established four-year institution and frequently their curriculum is more relevant to the needs of the disadvantaged students.

At the present time the State provides some financial assistance to such institutions, but the level of assistance is far less than that made avaliable to four-year institutions. In this way the State is in fact not giving as much assistance to the disadvantaged as to those from higher socio-economic backgrounds.

We believe that community colleges are particularly important for minority and disadvantaged students; they are also important for the entire State because it is largely through the community colleges that technical/vocational education is made available. We do not believe that the traditional college curriculum is necessarily the best avenue for all high school graduates to pursue. Therefore a strong community college system is essential.

Accordingly, we recommend that the level of State support for community colleges be substantially increased so that the State can more fully keep its constitutional commitment to provide equal opportunity. Therefore, we recommend that State support for community colleges be adjusted so that each student receives the same amount of assistance from the State. Each institution should receive appropriate assistance based on the number of students enrolled, with the per capita assistance being generally the same.

II. *RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN PROVIDING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

The achievement of equal opportunity in higher education is the proper concern of all citizens of Michigan. Many individuals, organizations, and institutions throughout the State have worked diligently toward the achievement of this goal. Yet, despite the efforts of so many people and groups, equal opportunity in higher education is not yet a reality in Michigan. Many minority and disadvantaged students are still denied equal access to the facilities of higher education, and equal right to use those facilities once they have been granted access.

While the goal of equal opportunity in higher education is properly the concern of all, and while the individual, the community, and the State as a whole have a responsibility to discharge, the primary responsibility for achieving and implementing that goal rests with the individual institutions of higher education in this State. We know that these institutions are both willing and anxious to fulfill their responsibilities to all the citizens of Michigan. Therefore, we recommend:

A. That all of the two and four-year colleges and universities throughout Michigan adopt a clear statement of their intentions and their determination to assist in achieving equal opportunity for all. We believe that universities and colleges should do more than adopt such a statement, that they should move with vigorous and effective programs to equalize and maximize educational opportunities for both minorities and disadvantaged students.

The adoption of such a statement, and the effectuation of the commitment to move toward

that goal, would be a major step toward clarifying the official position of our colleges and universities regarding their attitudes toward the enrollment of minority group and disadvantaged students. The wide range of diversified curricula in Michigan institutions of higher education make the implementation of this statement possible. The conflicting attitudes that have been expressed in the press and elsewhere concerning the position of university administrations, and individual members of university and college faculties, make this statement necessary. But even more important than the statement itself, is the movement toward the goal embodied in the statement. It is important, and it would be a step forward, for the governing body of every institution of higher education to make the statement. It would be even more meaningful, for the institutions concerned to begin achieving the goal itself.

B. That uniform data regarding minority group individuals be collected by all institutions of higher education in the following categories:

1). Minority and disadvantaged Black, Oriental and white students with separate categories for Mexican-American, American-Indian students *by class* and *curriculum*.

2). Black, Oriental, Mexican-American, American-Indian faculty *by discipline* and *rank*.

3). Black, Oriental, Mexican-American, and American-Indian personnel in supporting staff roles *by job classification*, for example, personnel in admissions, counseling, financial aids, health services, administration, secretarial staff, security, housing, athletics, maintenance, etc.

This information should be collected annually by all two- and four-year institutions of higher education in Michigan at each fall registration period and submitted to the State Department of Education no later than October 15 of the year in question. It would be our expectation that the State Department of Education would be willing to publish this data and make it available to the public on or before December 1 of the year in question so that we can better understand and appreciate the nature, the magnitude and current status of our efforts to equalize educational opportunities in Michigan for minority and disadvantaged students.

C. That in addition to accelerating the recruitment of Black, Oriental, American-Indian, and Mexican-American surnamed students, vigorous efforts be made by all institutions of higher education to increase the number of qualified Black, Oriental, American-Indian and Mexican-American faculty and supporting staff members.

The under-representation of minority group and disadvantaged students on most campuses in Michigan is exacerbated by the fact that these campuses also employ relatively few minority group faculty members and supporting staff personnel. Obviously, there is no intention or expectation on the part of the staff of the Task Force that universities will employ unqualified people, therefore, we are not suggesting employment or recruitment of Blacks or other minorities as such. We do believe that qualified people from all minority groups are available, and that universities and colleges which really wish to recruit them can do so. We believe they should do so. We also believe a two-pronged approach is required—a program of both active recruitment of minority students, as well as active recruitment of faculty members and supporting staff. Unless both of these activities are engaged in at the same time with equal vigor, neither can succeed. Both are essential.

We also point out that recruitment does not simply mean the process of trying to encourage minority group or disadvantaged students to enroll. Recruitment also means providing the necessary structured programs of incentives designed to inspire and stimulate realistic levels of aspiration for faculty, supporting staff members and students coming from minority ethnic groups or from economically deprived sections of our economy.

D. That the governing board and chief administrative personnel of each community college, college, and university, together with their respective faculty and student leaders should begin work immediately to establish enrollment goals for minority and disadvantaged students.

We recognize that for many reasons the capabilities of the 93 degree-granting institutions in Michigan vary considerably insofar as their ability to meet the needs of our minority group and disadvantaged students is concerned. Therefore, these goals should be realistically geared to the resources of the individual institution, including such factors as geographical location, community environment, and finances. We fur-

ther recommend that these goals should be established for each of the next five years, and be made public by April 1, 1971.

E. That faculties at each institution begin systematic efforts to include the lessons of the Black and other minority experiences in each of the academic disciplines wherein applies.

Discussions with minority students at a variety of Michigan campuses point up the fact of the commonality of their grievances, regardless of campus.

One of the grievances that appears to be applicable to all Michigan colleges and universities is the irrelevancy of most course curricula to minority student needs, aspirations, and experiences.

Institutions of higher education, as they now exist, are designed to primarily serve the needs of those students coming from white, middle-class backgrounds. Minority students who are concerned with the heritage and present life patterns of their communities cannot now find curricula which properly address themselves to that existence. Special techniques and resources must be developed to enable them to bring their present communities to a better life. Such concerns might include the development of relevant materials for teaching children, and the development of techniques for strengthening minority business and economics. They might also include a greater sensitivity toward the needs of minorities in areas such as medicine, psychology, fine arts, urban planning and most other curricula.

The belief that these needs are legitimate is shared by the greater student body of many institutions.

F. That colleges and universities take greater initiative through their faculty, students and administration to become more fully involved with the students, teachers, administrators and programs of the junior and senior high schools in their respective areas.

We note with a sense of encouragement the current initiative that the Legislature and the Governor have given in the form of a Street Academy Act designed to stimulate the creation of programs to assist the drop out and the potential drop out students. Through personal and formalized contact, college and high school personnel can jointly design pilot projects to reach the minority and disadvantaged students to whom higher education seems like a remote, if not an impossible, expectation even though many of these young people have a level of native intelligence, intellectual curiosity and potential motivation to become good calculated risks to succeed in our institutions of higher education.

G. That institutions of higher education in Michigan give evidence of their commitment to equalize educational opportunities for minority and disadvantaged students by providing, within their respective levels of financial capabilities, supportive and compensatory programs.

Such programs should include personalized counseling, tutoring services, reading clinics, programs designed to bring significant achievers to the campus as role models with whom minority and disadvantaged students could identify, and cultural media relevant to the experiences of minority and disadvantaged students. Furthermore, college and university financial aids programs directed specifically toward minority students should be developed from monies generated by the university through its tuition charges and private solicitations in addition to the federal and State funds that are acquired specifically for student financial aid. Over and above the supportive and compensatory services that the university offers the student when he actually enrolls, there is a need to provide structured summer orientation and study programs for the minority and disadvantaged students who have been admitted for fall enrollment. Therefore, we further recommend that these colleges and universities develop and expand summer programs for newly-enrolled minority students similar to the summer Upward Bound programs.

H. That colleges and universities in Michigan reflect their appreciation and comprehension of the significance of minority ethnic group achievers by appointing such persons to both advisory and decision-making committees and by bestowing university honors upon said individuals including distinguished alumni awards, of merit and honorary degrees.

On the whole, we have found that minority, ethnic group persons are under-represented on such advisory and decision-making committees. We also have found that university honors too rarely go to such people.

According to a survey of 32 four-year colleges in Michigan conducted by the Detroit Urban League, only *1%* of the Honorary Doctorate

degrees awarded by these colleges have ever been awarded to Blacks.*

I. **That all Michigan colleges and universities work cooperatively with students to establish systematic mechanisms and/or procedures for handling student problems and grievances as well as for presenting and responding to programs to promote equal opportunity. Further, we strongly recommend that once such mechanisms and procedures have been established, administrations should utilize them and support them.**

We believe that a major source of campus problems has been the lack of communication between administrations and students. In crisis situations, it is difficult to establish new systems or mechanisms. We believe that the continual existence and utilization of such systems can prevent misunderstanding. In the event a misunderstanding should arise, such a system can help end it. Moreover, since many students believe that administrators are not sincere when establishing such mechanisms, we believe that it is essential for administrators to make it clear that they will meet students halfway and cooperate in promoting the common good of their total educational community.

J. **That all Michigan colleges and universities undertake a full review of their traditional examination and grading systems.**

It is the considered judgment of this Task Force that the traditional examination and grading systems employed by most colleges and universities in Michigan treat minority group and disadvantaged students unfairly as they relate to their specific needs. Therefore, the purpose of such a review would not be to eliminate the judgmental factor but rather to make the exercise of judgment more truly reflective of sound objective analysis of the student's level or promise, potential and preparation for achievement.

Michigan colleges and universities should work in the direction of developing more adequate and reliable indices to discover the existence of traits, i.e., level of motivation and intellectual curiosity, deemed necessary to make a student a good prospect to meet the college's or university's requirements satisfactorily and to profit from the experience.

Furthermore, this endeavor should be coupled with the development of viable, supportive and compensatory services offered to minority and disadvantaged students so that these revised indices can be most effectively implemented.

K. **That all colleges and universities in Michigan make an appropriate financial commitment to help defray the college and university expenses of their minority or disadvantaged students.**

We believe that equal opportunity is best realized when there is student, institutional and societal involvement in the financial commitment required to meet the minority or disadvantaged students' college and university expenses.

We further believe that equal opportunity is best promoted within a firm structure of student support including financial assistance from society (Legislative appropriations, student tuition money and private grants), work (a student can and probably should be involved in working a limited number of hours in order to make a specific contribution to the financial package), and loans (modest but reasonable parental and student commitment). Institutional commitment should be made in terms of a specific allotment of university funds for supportive and compensatory programs. We believe that equal opportunity should not and cannot be a totally free package to students. The key to achievement in this case is involvement by society, by the student, and by the institution.

L. **That inter-institutional cooperative agreements be worked out between the various colleges and universities to facilitate the admittance of minority and disadvantaged student baccalaureate graduates into graduate and professional programs.**

The special problems of minority group and disadvantaged students are not confined to the under-graduate level. Therefore, institutional support and recognition of the legitimate needs and aspirations of minority graduate students should not be ignored. We believe that the development of the aforementioned cooperative agreements would be of considerable help to these students. Additionally, of course, every effort should be made to seek the financial assistance that would be needed to equalize educational opportunity for minority and disadvantaged students at the graduate level.

III. *RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY IN ASSURING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

We believe that the interests of the State as a whole include the interests of each community in the State.

*The response to the Urban League Survey is contained in the Appendix in the official report presented to the Governor.

We also believe that each community can contribute significantly to the achievement of equal opportunity in higher education, as in all other fields of human concern.

Accordingly, we recommend:

A. That every community in the State, through its governmental and educational leaders, make a clear commitment to equal opportunity in higher education. In order to accomplish this objective, we further recommend that each community:

1). Establish a "local coalition" of civic, business, governmental, religious and educational leaders, to promote more and better counseling of students in high schools, to develop and disseminate information on careers, to seek out potential college students in their own community and advise them of available opportunities.

2). Encourage the establishment by local institutions, organizations, service clubs, etc., of local scholarship programs which are accessible primarily to the disadvantaged student.

3). Establish programs where local persons enrolled in colleges and universities can return to their community, and to their high school, to advise and counsel present high school students in the promise and problems of higher education.

4). Recognize that equal opportunity in higher education cannot be achieved automatically. Its achievement will only come when every community and each of its citizens have made a full commitment to equal opportunity in *all* areas, including housing, employment, public accommodation, and other fields of human activity.

B. That every community in the State, and every individual resident of each community, encourage the mass media locally to give balanced coverage to events concerning students and institutions of higher education, and to emphasize positive programs contributing to equal opportunity, as well as the resulting benefits to the community.

C. That every community in the State which contains an institution of higher education establish programs which will bring together "town and gown". This can be done through such programs as "foster families", in which a family "adopts" a college or university student while he attends school in the community; regular exchanges between civic, governmental and other community leaders and college students; and other similar devices.

One of the principal problems faced in the communities which contain institutions of higher education is the lack of understanding which frequently prevails concerning the significance of such an institution for the community. Too often, the school is looked upon only as a burden; in truth, the school is usually vital to the continued prosperity of the community, and certainly, every institution of higher education contributes significantly to the cultural and social life of the community. We believe it is important for these facts to be understood, so that the mutuality of interests can be recognized and developed.

D. That State government take the initiative in encouraging local communities to move in the direction of equal opportunity in higher education. This can be done through devices such as:

1). A governor's tour of selected college and university communities, with all events being built around the theme of equal opportunity. Two days a year could be set aside for such a purpose, with the Governor visiting those communities which have made particular progress toward the goal of equal opportunity in higher education.

2). A state annual awards program for equal opportunity in higher education. Each year, the state could sponsor a program which would grant clear recognition to those communities, organizations, mass media outlets, school districts and institutions of higher education which had done the most to advance the cause of equal opportunity.

3). A program whereby the State Department of Education would prepare information on career opportunities, college admission procedures, scholarships and supportive services, course offerings and enrollment openings. Such information should be continuously updated, and be made readily available to students, institutions and communities.

4). A conference of leaders throughout the State to explore the feasibility of establishing a Michigan Theater of Science and Industry which would illustrate and dramatize the State's social, physical and economic activity, and which would employ satellite mobile vans to carry the same message to the far corners of the State. The purpose of this theater and its satel-

lites would be to inspire the young people in their career choices, and to assist them in planning for the attainment of their goals.

The Task Force recognizes that in describing the role of the community in promoting equal opportunity, we have placed the responsibility of leadership upon the Governor. As Chief Executive of the State, he personifies its hopes and aspirations, and opportunities. Under the leadership of the Governor, we believe the communities of Michigan can and will do more.

IV. *RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE ROLE OF STUDENTS IN ASSURING EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION*

The Task Force believes that equal opportunity in higher education can only be achieved if all the forces in our society work cooperatively toward the achievement of that goal. State and local government have roles to play, as do the institutions of higher education and the communities in which such institutions are located. In the final analysis, however, college and university students themselves have a primary role to play; for it's the manner in which students treat one another, including disadvantaged and minority group students, which can insure that equal access to education, once achieved, becomes equal opportunity in education. For this reason, we recommend:

A. That student bodies, student governments, and student organizations, make clear commitments to the assurance of equal opportunity for all, and that all such groups as well as individual students honor such commitments.

On every campus, and in every educational setting, the attitudes of administration, faculty, and the general community are quite important. Thus the educational environment is shaped by contributions from all these sectors. We therefore believe that students have an important role to play in producing a favorable environment; we believe that administrations have an obligation to work closely with students in such areas.

B. That students work with the administration of the institutions of higher education in establishing systematic mechanisms and/or procedures for handling student problems and grievances as well as for presenting and responding to programs to promote equal opportunity. Further, we strongly recommend that once such mechanisms and procedures have been established, students utilize them and support them. We further recommend that students exert their influence and attempt to control dissidents and skeptics in their own ranks who might seek to scuttle or circumvent such mechanisms and procedures.

We believe that the administrations of most institutions of higher education are sincerely anxious to provide processes to enable students to make inputs into the educational process. Frequently, such administrations feel that students are too skeptical of their intentions and that students will not cooperate with such mechanisms for peaceful change where established. We therefore believe that it is essential that student leaders make it clear that they will meet educational administrators halfway and cooperate with them in promoting the common good of their total educational community.

C. That all students who are committed to equal opportunity in higher education form a "campus coalition" to undertake activities designed to promote such equal opportunity. Included in such activities could be the following:

1). A "buddy system" to provide incoming and current minority students with support, orientation, information, and friendship to make entrance into the higher education setting easier and smoother.

2). A program of orienting current and new white students, many of whom have had little exposure to minority groups themselves, to understand and not to fear the new situations they will face, to promote interracial understanding, and to make it possible for all students to achieve their maximum in higher education.

3). A program of volunteer tutoring, counseling and recruitment of minority group students to complement the institution efforts in this area. Such a program should include efforts to spark the motivation of incoming students, encouragement to enter other than the usual or traditional fields or careers, and efforts to involve them in other campus and community activities besides their academic work.

4). Fund-raising programs to assist the institution to meet its financial commitment to equality of opportunity, particularly for grant and scholarship aid.

5). Contact with minority-group and majority-group residents in the community where the institution is located to build support and understanding for the students' needs and efforts, and to develop friendships

which will reduce feelings of being isolated at the institution.

6). Programs of mutual support wherein the students assist in projects of community concern, and enlist the support from the community for student projects and activities.

7). A program where students come to know the leaders in city government, business, press, etc., so that when tensions arise students are able to communicate with those outside the institutions who may be making some of the decisions and public statements.

8). A program systematically developed to identify problems of minority students on campus; to present these problems to the appropriate bodies (hopefully the ones outlined above) through their duly chosen representatives for solution; and to assist in implementing the solutions.

9). To be a reliable spokesman for the goal of equality of opportunity in higher education by bringing problems and situations before the institution public (via campus newspaper and campus groups, etc.), and before the community and general public (through the press and community groups).

10). And, extremely important, to publicize the efforts and accomplishments of this coalition group and its individual members as contributing substantially toward the progress of equality of opportunity in higher education.

APPENDIX B

MEMBERSHIP: AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EQUALITY OF ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. David Booker, student
Wayne State University

Mrs. Kathleen Bright, member
Board of Education
Highland Park Public Schools

Mr. Noah Brown, Vice-President
Wayne State University

Mr. Hugh DePree, member
Board of Trustees, Hope College

Mr. Gerald Elliott, Chief Editorial Writer
Grand Rapids Press

Dr. Robert Geake, Trustee-at-Large
Schoolcraft College

Mr. Donald Laughner, faculty member
Delta College

Dr. Rudolf B. Schmerl, Assistant Dean for Research,
School of Education
University of Michigan

Mr. Richard Simonson, student
Albion College

Dr. Mildred Beatty Smith, member
Board of Trustees
Eastern Michigan University

Mr. David C. Spriggs*
Executive Director
Detroit Business Institute

Mrs. Kathleen Straus, citizen
Detroit, Michigan

Dr. Oscar Taboada, faculty member
Michigan State University

Miss Janice Vincent, student
Macomb County Community College

Mr. John Winchester, Director of Indian Affairs
Center for Urban Affairs
Michigan State University

Dr. James Woodruff, Vice-President
University of Detroit

Mr. Edwin E. Wuehle, Superintendent
Manistique Public Schools

Ex-officio Members

Governor's Office:

Mr. James Phelps

House of Representatives

Rep. Peter Kok
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Rep. Vincent J. Petitpren
Wayne, Michigan

State Senate

Senator Gilbert E. Bursley
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Senator George S. Fitzgerald
Grosse Pointe Park, Michigan

*Additional Participants***

Mr. David Coleman, ex-officio
Executive Officio of the Governor

Mr. Carles Gordon, Director
Special Student Services
Wayne State University

Mrs. Janice Tice, Assistant to
Senator Gilbert Bursley

*Mr. Spriggs was transferred to a position in another state during the course of Committee deliberations and was thus forced to withdraw from further participation.

**Mr. Coleman was a replacement for Mr. Phelps; Mr. Gordon represented Mr. Brown at a number of Committee meetings; and Mrs. Tice represented Senator Bursley, when he was unable to attend.

RECOMMENDATIONS: AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EQUALITY OF ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

1. **This Committee recommends that the State Board of Education appoint an ad hoc Committee to study and make recommendations for appropriate action pertaining to the quality of elementary and secondary schooling.**

2. **The State Board of Education should assume a major share of the responsibility for the identification of students for higher education in Michigan.**

   Both immediate steps and long-range planning are required. For the present, a statewide admissions-information system should be designed and established, compiling present and (it is hoped) expanding opportunities for access to higher education in publicity that will permit easy comparison of key points (tuition, scholarships, requirements, main programs of study, ethnic composition of study body and faculty, housing, etc.). Such publicity should reach students in every high school in the state; further, it should be distributed through churches, unions, lodges, community organizations, every conceivable avenue which will reach people. This system should include a referral service to assist students not only to find but also to apply to and enter the institution most suited to their needs.

   Long-range planning (which should culminate not in a report, but in action) should focus on the sort of research needed to establish a realistic, talent-oriented assessment of Michigan secondary school pupils. Such an assessment would be conducted annually throughout the state, of as large a sample of Michigan high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors as possible. It would be better to begin with sophomores if only one class level could be assessed at the start. The results of this assessment, appropriately generalized, in combination with the admissions-information system should be highly useful in helping each student choose the college or university he feels would offer him the most of what he wants. (To the Committee's knowledge, no single institution or agency in the state is pre-eminent in educational research. It may well be that the state could make no wiser investment of its research dollars than in an institute or center, whether affiliated with one or more schools or whether an independent unit, devoted to basic as well as applied research intended to improve the education of our citizens.)

3. **The State Board of Education should conduct a study of differences in college attendance among Michigan high schools.**

   Such factors as the geographical accessibility of higher education, the availability of information about higher education to high school students, attitudes and behaviors of high school counselors, testing practices in the high schools, and prior experiences of students from particular schools—should be investigated as possible barriers to the adequate identification of students for higher education.

4. **The State of Michigan should provide national leadership in securing a revision of techniques used for the identification of pupil talents and abilities.**

   The Committee urges consideration of recent findings that current, commonly-used examinations fail to recognize and uncover a wide variety of student talents, skills, and mental attributes.[1] Many potential college students are thereby penalized. We urge state leadership in the development of identification procedures not limited to verbal and mathematical ability, but incorporating many other dimensions (e.g., leadership, social sensitivity, non-verbal expression) of individual potential.

5. **Since a "self-identification" of students for higher education will occur if college opportunities are made more accessible, the State should ensure that all geographic regions and centers of population in Michigan are served by community colleges.**

   There is an obvious relationship between proximity and the probability of attending college.[2] Large numbers of students are more likely to enter college if they can attend an institution permitting them to live at home, work part-time and commute.

1. *Righting the Balance*, a Report of the Commission on Tests (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970).
2. Warren W. Willingham, Free-Access Higher Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), pp. 16-17.

6. **A statewide recruitment system should be established to match the needs, potential abilities, and desires of prospective college students with the characteristics – real and desired – of our existing institutions.**

This recommendation is complex and requires somewhat detailed elaboration. Both students and institutional identities must be respected. Diversity should be encouraged, indeed strengthened. But competitive recruiting in which institutions vie with one another for the same Black or Chicano or Indian students to meet some recently established quota is exactly the wrong way to go about it.

There is no apparent reason to believe that Michigan colleges and universities will, on their own, develop a collaborative system for recruiting minority-group students. Nor should they be asked to try. For them, such a system would be expensive inordinately difficult to administer effectively, and cumbersome. The alternative is to place the responsibility squarely on the State Department of Education. It has the advantages of a statewide perspective, the obligation of being responsive to the duly elected representatives of the people who finance public education, and of being responsible for and informed about the affairs of elementary and secondary school systems—the sources of prospective college students.

A recruiting system administered by the State Department of Education might begin with the practice reputed to be successfully employed by Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland. The college is reported to employ "educational counselors," who work in a community they know and where they are known, to advise "clients" about educational opportunities existing throughout the Cleveland area. They do not specifically recruit students for the community college, although they are paid by it, but instead try to match an individual's interests and needs with the best possible educational choice available—whether it is a barber's college, a university, the community college, or perhaps no school at all. Such an approach, administered centrally by the Department and operated locally throughout the State, could use many of the present recruiters on college campuses to work with these counselors rather than prospective students. Or college recruiters could be paid by the State and assigned to various communities. The important point is that the *recruiters' loyalties should be shifted from institutions to people needing their help, and that the process should be related to a state wide plan.*

This might well mean that some institutions would rarely, if ever, be recommended to entering freshmen as the college to attend. But there should be no stigma attached to an institution (or, more likely, a given program in an institution) which fails to attract minority-students in sizable numbers. If Black students are unresponsive to appeals to enroll in a veterinary medicine program, for instance, that does not mean that the program is "racist" or "irrelevant"; if Chicanos exhibit comparatively little interest in attending Lutheran colleges, that does not mean that Lutheran colleges should be accused of bigotry against them. But if Blacks want to enroll in teacher training programs in greater numbers than a given institution can accommodate, then it should be clear that neighboring institutions with such programs must share the responsibility to provide those students with suitable opportunities. If Indians in the Upper Peninsula are interested in enrolling in paramedical training programs offered only at community colleges in the southeastern part of the State, then they should be assisted to enroll in them.

7. **All Michigan community colleges should be "free-access" institutions – with an open door to any person, with or without a high school diploma, who wishes to enter higher education.**

Any person over the age of 18 who wishes to attend college, regardless of motive, regardless of preparation, regardless of anything but desire, should be assured admittance to a community college. Michigan's community colleges can and must play a greater role in attracting tri-ethnic minority students to higher education if equality of opportunity is to be served.

8. **The State Board of Education should support, encourage, and assist Michigan's colleges and universities in efforts to increase minority group enrollments. A statewide "quota" system for minority admissions is inadvisable; however, each institution should be encouraged to set, and to make public, specific minority enrollment objectives for the next five years.**

9. **The State Board of Education should encourage Michigan's colleges and universities to make it possible for their students to participate in the admissions process.**

Students, and particularly members of minority groups, should be voting members of admissions committees; should be encouraged to help with recruiting efforts; and should, in fact, play a role in recruiting new students comparable to that played by faculty members in recruiting new teachers.

10. **The State Board of Education should conduct a statewide study of admissions policies and practices among the State's colleges and universities. The study should include an investigation of transfer opportunities from two-year to four-year institutions.**

11. **The State Competitive Scholarship Program which, for the 1971-72 school year, will have an allocation of approximately $8,000,000 needs to be significantly modified. Currently, this program provides 1.1% of these funds to disadvantaged students. We feel that a minimum of 15% of these funds should be awarded to minority group students. This can be accomplished by:**

    (a) Establishing awards on a geographical and school distribution basis which would guarantee that the five students with the highest scores for each Michigan high school would receive a Michigan Competitive Scholarship grant, provided that recipients qualify according to financial need;

    (b) Continuing to determine the amount of the scholarship by financial need as well as test score performance—whereby a student from a very low-income family would receive a significantly higher scholarship than a student from an upper-income family. The guarantee that students would be competing with peers of similar educational background and circumstances would significantly increase the number of minority group students receiving scholarships.

12. **The Michigan Tuition Grant for the present academic year is funded at the level of $5,200,000. The percent of minority group students receiving these funds is 9.1. With the increased number of minority group students attending private institutions, we feel this percentage should be significantly increased for the 1971-72 school year.**

    This could best be accomplished by the elimination of the requirement to take the Michigan Competitive Scholarship Test to be eligible for full year grants.

    We cannot sufficiently stress the need to eliminate the Competitive Scholarship requirement as a prerequisite for Michigan Tuition Grants. This seriously mitigates against a specific segment of the Michigan school population because counseling services and knowledge regarding financial aid programs are minimal in inner city high schools. We further feel that the need factor for these grants must be firmly documented.

13. **That an Opportunity Awards Program be established for the 1971-72 school year, with an initial allocation of $5,000,000.**

    The State Board of Education has previously endorsed a similar proposal and proposed legislation was recommended to the Legislature by the State Board in January. Five million dollars would support between 10,000 and 12,000 students each year. The maximum grant made available to any one student would be $500 and that award would be determined solely by the financial need of an individual student. A student coming from a family with an income of under $5,000 a year would be eligible for both a Michigan Tuition Grant and a State Opportunity Award. The purpose of the Opportunity Awards would be to help offset some of the real costs of education which would include: transportation, lunch money, clothing, and incidental expenses that are not computed in terms of institutional costs but become an important factor when a student is unable to work to pay for his living costs and when family funds are not available to supplement these needs.

14. **That the State of Michigan establish a state revolving loan program whereby students who are unable to secure a guaranteed loan through a private lending agency would be able to apply for assistance directly through the State of Michigan.**

    The State Board of Education has previously endorsed such a proposal, and proposed legislation to create a state revolving loan program was recommended to the Legislature by the State Board in January. This proposal seeks $1,000,000 annually for student loans until such time as loan repayments would enable this program to be self-sustaining.

15. **That the State of Michigan establish a program which will fund institutions for supportive services to disadvantaged students.**

    The State allocation for the 1971-72 school year should be a $5,000,000 appropriation and institutions could submit proposals on a competitive basis that would be evaluated by merit and institution commitment. This program would provide educational resources, tutorial services, counseling, and curriculum innovation, all of which would assist Michigan colleges and universities to help their students to graduate within a four-year period.

16. **Special Assistance Programs should be established with state grants on a project basis to institutions of higher education for: (a) the development of new instructional and curricular strategies for the education of students from minority groups, and (b) programs to promote an understanding and acceptance of minority students by faculty, students, and the community.**

Patterns of institutional "racism" of irrelevant curricula, of "unaware" faculties, of rigid and doctrinaire administrators—must be altered if equal access is to become equal educational opportunity. The state can become a catalyst for such change through the provision of special grants to institutions who are willing to attempt to change.

17. **An equality of educational opportunity requires the addition of Black, Chicano, and American Indian personnel in key positions on college and university staffs.**

Adequate role models for minority students, curricular and instructional changes, and altered institutional procedures and policies—are important by-products of efforts to add minority staff members, which are essential to the success of equal opportunities programs.

18. **It is recommended that the State assume greater responsibility for an equalization of opportunities for entrance into and completion of programs of study in higher education, through the expanded provision of additional training mechanisms in areas of the State with large tri-ethnic minority and geographically disadvantaged populations.**

The experimental program of Neighborhood Education Centers presently being initiated on a limited basis in some low-income communities in Michigan should be encouraged and expanded. Such agencies, acting as On-to-Education Opportunity Centers, in a "store-front" capacity, should be established in tri-ethnic minority and geographically isolated areas throughout the State. Each local establishment should function as a pre-college training, recruitment, and information center for its neighborhood or community—to assist high school graduates and dropouts in meeting the entrance and academic skill requirements for higher education.

19. **The State Board of Education should explore possibilities for the establishment of an "external degree program" in Michigan.**

Despite the relatively generous opportunities for higher education in the State of Michigan, there are very many able adults who because of physical handicaps, geographic isolation, economic circumstances, poor preparation in elementary and secondary school, responsibility for dependent parents or children, or other reasons simply have not had —and may never have—a chance to go to college, even on a part-time basis.

An "external degree program" in Michigan could considerably broaden the base of opportunity for participation in higher education. Such a program could enable people not enrolled in college to earn baccalaureate degrees in their own time through independent study and examination. Tests, or other arrangements, for granting credit toward a degree could be developed and administered under the authority of the State Board of Education.

The idea is not a new one. There is considerable experience with external degree programs in Britain, Australia, and other countries. Britain's experience dates back to 1836 when the University of London was established as an examining body; in fact, it had no internal students until 1900. Australia's programs have long been in operation and originally were created because of the geographical remoteness of great parts of the population.

Interest in external degree programs also is growing rapidly in this country—in New York, Wisconsin, Florida, and elsewhere. In September, 1970, New York's Commissioner of Education, Ewald Nyquist, announced that the New York State Regents will soon establish an external degree program to enable qualified persons not enrolled in college to earn degrees through independent study and examination. The New York State Education Department is developing and already using a series of New York Proficiency Exams as the basis for granting College credit. Through the help of the Carnegie Corporation, the College Board for six years has been developing CLEP—the College Level Examination Program. There are now about 33 of these examinations; 500 colleges and universities accept successful completion of them as a basis for college credit.

20. **The concept of an "open door" to the community college and a liberalized admissions policy to the four-year institutions must not develop into a "revolving door."**

To insure that appropriate avenues are available after the student is admitted, adequate financial and instructional support must be provided. Diversity, with options for intermittent study, a wide array of educational alternatives, and freedom of movement from one program to another, must be encouraged.

21. The State Board of Education, in cooperation with the institutions, should establish a monitoring system designed to produce evidence that each institution, as a minimum, is:

(a) increasing the enrollment of Black, Chicano, and American Indian students;

(b) increasing the rate of retention of these students;

(c) successfully incorporating these students into the total life of the higher education community;

(d) increasing the recruitment of minority-group staff members in all areas;

(e) has eliminated all policies that are restrictive or discriminatory toward the members of minority groups—including students, faculty, and all non-academic staff;

(f) continually evaluating and taking steps to eliminate all racist practices, subtle as well as blatant;

(g) basing priority decisions on immediate and long-term manpower requirements, i.e., providing all students with a realistic assessment of job opportunities available to them upon completion of their programs; and

(h) intensifying existing programs or establishing new programs that bear directly on improving the quality of life for all citizens.

22. The State Board of Education and the Bureau of the Budget, in the program and budget review process, and the Legislature in its decisions on appropriations, should evaluate individual institutional requests for support and program funds on the basis of each institution's affirmative action in the above areas. A comparable policy is already in effect in the State of Illinois.

23. The Legislature, in planning its annual appropriations for the support of higher education, should set aside a percentage of the total amount availabe to be distributed to those institutions which are making or propose to make significant contributions to the improvement of the quality of life now endured by the tri-ethnic minorities.

Such contributions could be in education, research, or service, e.g., a new instructional program in nursing in the Detroit area, where there is a severe shortage of nurses and where tri-ethnic minorities lack access to nursing programs; or a survey of the changing vocational plans of young minority-group members to assess the contemporaneity of the offerings of local institutions; or a community health program which would combine the training of health workers in the complex health problems of the poor with health services in locations accessible to people now deprived of them. Amounts allocated, which would be apart from amounts for the institutions' general requests, would depend on separate proposals by the institutions which could be evaluated, accepted, or turned down in ways comparable to those used by federal granting agencies. Renewal requests would have to be accompanied by progress reports. Nothing that was demonstrated to be related to the objective state above would be excluded from consideration, whether it involved constructions, equipment, transportation, etc.

24. The Legislature, to encourage institutions to make the objective stated above integral with their own priorities, should consider either or both of the following devices:

(a) A supplemental and proportionate appropriation to institutions which can demonstrate that they are investing a given percentage of their resources in programs designed to meet the above objective. It is true that some of the State's institutions are not, at present, well situated or staffed or oriented to make any sizable investments of this sort. But they would be encouraged to exert themselves still further. Whether this or that institution would thus receive more or less support is irrelevant. This issue is the enhancement of the responsiveness of the State's institutions to the needs of tri-ethnic minorities.

(b) Full (because it would be the *first* order of business) funding of all existing (i.e., previously approved) programs intended to benefit tri-ethnic minorities.

APPENDIX C

TO: State Board of Education
DATE: December 19, 1972
FROM: Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education
SUBJECT: Report & Recommendations From State Board of Education Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education

The State Board of Education approved the appointment of a Subcommittee of the Board to "develop proposals to provide greater equal educational opportunity in postsecondary education, considering:

- Omnibus Higher Education Legislation
- Private Trade and Technical Schools, and
- Other Related Matters"

The subcommittee in carrying out its assignment was ever mindful that Equality of Access to Higher Education has been one of the major goals of the State Board of Education since it adopted the State Plan for Higher Education on June 11, 1969.

The subcommittee was also very much aware that:

a. the Superintendent of Public Instruction was formulating a comprehensive plan for better organizing the delivery services for postsecondary education, which has now been reviewed and received by the State Board

b. the Task Force on Equality of Access to Higher Education has directed its primary attention to increasing minority enrollments and

c. The Task Force on Goal Four was concentrating their efforts on developing proposals to provide greater access to private higher education, which proposals have now been received and adopted by the State Board.

Considering these facts the subcommittee decided to explore how best to implement:

a. Resolution of June 30, 1971 before the State Board of Education endorsing a "K-14 system of free public education to insure equal educational opportunity for all in a substantive manner and in a manner that will be least expensive to the students, their parents, and the taxpayers." and

b. Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education Plan—Community Colleges and Occupational Education which states:

> each State which desires to receive assistance under this subpart shall develop a statewide plan for the expansion or improvement of postsecondary education programs in Community Colleges or both considering two years of tuition free or low-tuition postsecondary education within a reasonable distance.

In this regard, California has already established the precedent for offering this type of equality of access to post-secondary education.

Michigan has a post-secondary system that is also readily adaptable to providing this type of equality of opportunity. The projected Freshman and Sophomore tuition fees for 1973-74 school year is approximately $34.5 million. However, a portion of these costs is already included in the approximately $6 million of state and federal financial assistance currently being provided to community college students. If we assume that half of the $6 million is used for tuition and fees—the costs of providing a K-14 system of free public education, utilizing the community colleges would be approximately $31.5 million.

The estimated 1972 fall enrollment in public community colleges is 137,600 headcount or 74,000 full-time equivalent students. This would make the costs of this program approximately $230 per headcount or $426 per full-time equivalent student.

Recommendation No. 1 — It is recommended that the State Board of Education in keeping with (a) its policy of providing equality of access to postsecondary education; (b) its proposed Resolution of June 1971 endorsing a K-14 system of free public education, and (c) Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education Bill, request the Superintendent to develop a proposal to examine the effects of providing either tuition-free or lower cost education in the public Community and Junior Colleges and implementation plans for submission to the State Board of Education.

The second charge to the subcommittee was to provide greater equality of educational opportunity in regard to private trade and technical schools. This is also in keeping with the goals in the State Plan for Higher Education as well as Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education legislation.

The latter includes in its definition of Community Colleges, "Any junior college, postsecondary vocational school, technical institute or any other educational in-

stitution which"—it then lists some specific criteria including these institutions granting an associate degree.

In this regard, there are a number of students who are attending or who would be interested in attending private trade and technical schools in Michigan, but find it more difficult to receive financial assistance because the schools are not approved to grant associate degrees. However, a number of states already provide these type of schools with special degree granting authority in technical areas, namely: Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Virginia and Massachusetts. These special degrees are somewhat comparable to the traditional associate in arts degree.

The subcommittee believe the students in Michigan should have the same equality of access to postsecondary education as the students in these other states.

Recommendation No. 2 — It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the establishment of an Associate in Technical Studies Degree to be awarded by the trade and technical schools and request the Superintendent to develop specific proposals to implement this recommendation.

The third charge to the subcommittee was a general one and that was to investigate additional matters as related to providing greater equality of educational opportunity in postsecondary education.

In this regard the subcommittee wants to call particular attention to the recent agreement entered into by a number of public Baccalaureate Institutions and Community Colleges recognizing and accepting the Community College general education courses for transfer purposes.

Recommendation No. 3 — It is recommended that the State Board of Education request the Superintendent to develop a Resolution, for Board approval, commending those colleges and universities who have taken such a positive first step to better provide equality of access to postsecondary education and encouraging all colleges and universities to take similar and/or more comprehensive action.

The deliberations of this subcommittee point to the desirability of further investigation of this matter, particularly in relation to the other aspects of the Omnibus Higher Education Legislation.

Recommendation No. 4 — It is recommended that the State Board of Education appoint another subcommittee, after January 1, 1973, to continue the work of this subcommittee and to develop recommendations for the Board's considerations relative to the other aspects of the Omnibus Higher Education Legislation.

The Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education recommends that the State Board of Education:

1. Receive the report.
2. Refer recommendations No. 1 and No. 2 to the State Board of Education's Council on Higher Education.
3. Adopt recommendations No. 3 and No. 4.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MEMORANDUM

Date: December 26, 1972

TO: Dr. Robert Huxol
FROM: John W. Porter, Chairman
SUBJECT: State Board of Education Action on Subcommittee Report on Equality of Access to Higher Education

Following is an abstract of the minutes of the State Board of Education meeting of December 20, 1972:

The following recommendations were made by the Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education:

Recommendation No. 1. It is recommended that the State Board of Education in keeping with (a) its policy of providing equality of access to post-secondary education; (b) its proposed Resolution of June, 1971 endorsing a K-14 system of free public education, and (c) Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education Bill, request the Superintendent to develop a proposal to examine the effects of providing either tuition-free or lower cost education in the public community and junior colleges and implementation plans for submission to the State Board of Education.

Recommendation No. 2. It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the establishment of an Associate in Technical Studies Degree to be awarded by the trade and technical schools and request the Superintendent to develop specific proposals to implement this recommendation.

Recommendation No. 3. It is recommended that the State Board of Education request the Superintendent to develop a Resolution, for Board approval, commending those colleges and universities who have taken such a positive first step to better provide equality of access to post-secondary education and encouraging all colleges and universities to take similar and/or more comprehensive action.

Recommendation No. 4. It is recommended that the State Board of Education appoint another subcommittee, after January 1, 1973, to continue the work of this subcommittee and to develop recommendations for the Board's consideration relative to the other aspects of the Omnibus Higher Education Legislation.

Mr. O'Neil moved, seconded by Dr. Morton, that the State Board of Education (1) receive the report of December 19, 1972, from the Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education; (2) refer Recommendations No. 1 and No. 2 to the State Board of Education's Council on Higher Education and ask for its recommendation in three months; and (3) adopt Recommendations No. 3 and No. 4.

Ms. Kelly offered a substitute motion, seconded by Mrs. Miller, that the Recommendations be amended as follows: "Recommendation No. 1. It is recommended that the State Board of Education ~~in keeping with (a) its policy of providing equality of access to post-secondary education; (b) its proposed Resolution of June, 1971 endorsing a K-14 system of free public education, and (c) Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education Bill,~~ request the Superintendent to develop a proposal REPORT to examine the effects of providing either tuition-free or lower cost education in the public community and junior colleges and implementation plans for submission to the State Board of Education." "Recommendation No. 2. It is recommended that the State Board of Education ~~approve the establishment of an~~ REQUEST THE SUPERINTENDENT TO PREPARE A REPORT FOR THE BOARD EVALUATING THE ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING an Associate in Technical Studies Degree to be awarded by the trade and technical schools and request the Superintendent to develop specific proposals to implement this recommendation"; and further moved that Recommendations No. 3 and No. 4 be deleted.

Mr. O'Neil called for a point of order. He said it was not the prerogative of any member to change the Subcommittee's report, but it was the prerogative of the Board to decide what to do with the report. He asked for a ruling from the Chair.

The Chair ruled that Ms. Kelly's substitute motion was in order because the motion of the Subcommittee dealt with the four recommendations. Dr. Porter read from page 423 of Roberts' Rules of Order confirming the Chair's ruling.

Ms. Kelly withdrew her substitute motion; Mrs. Miller her second.

Mr. O'Neil withdrew his motion; Dr. Morton his second.

Mr. O'Neil moved, seconded by Ms. Kelly, that the State Board of Education receive the report of the Board Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education, dated December 19, 1972.

Ayes: Brennan, Kelly, Miller, Morton, Novak, O'Neil, Riethmiller

Absent: Deeb

The motion carried.

Ms. Kelly moved, seconded by Mrs. Miller, that the Recommendations of the Board Subcommittee on Equality of Access to Higher Education be amended as follows: "Recommendation No. 1. It is recommended that the State Board of Education ~~in keeping with (a) its policy of providing equality of access to post-secondary education; (b) its proposed Resolution of June, 1971 endorsing a K-14 system of free public education; and (c) Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education Bill,~~ request the Superintendent to develop ~~a proposal~~ REPORT to examine the efforts of providing either tuition-free or lower cost education in the public community and junior colleges and implementation plans for submission to the State Board of Education." Recommendation No. 2. It is recom-

mended that the State Board of Education ~~approve the establishment of an~~ REQUEST THE SUPERINTENDENT TO PREPARE A REPORT FOR THE BOARD EVALUATING THE ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING an Associate in Technical Studies Degree to be awarded by the trade and technical schools and request the Superintendent to develop specific proposals to implement this recommendation"; and further moved the deletion of Recommendations No. 3 and No. 4.

A roll-call vote was taken on the motion.

Novak: Aye
Brennan: Aye
Riethmiller: Aye
Miller: Aye
Kelly: Aye
O'Neil: *Nay
Morton: **Nay
Deeb: Absent

The motion carried.

*Mr. O'Neil explained his "nay" vote. "I find this action by the Board deeply disappointing in view of the study over the many years and its policy of providing equality of access to post-secondary education; a resolution that is still pending before the Board endorsing the K-14 system of free public education, which action was only referred until an Attorney General's opinion could be received regarding the constitutionality of tuition which we now have received; and in view of Title X of the Omnibus Higher Education Bill which calls for this. I also vote "no" because, as Dr. Morton has said regarding the Associate Degree in Technical Studies, many students who, because of this technicality will not take advantage of an education because they cannot receive equal financial assistance with those going to community colleges by going to trade schools because of the technicality of award degrees, will not be provided, and I hardly think asking for a report will effectuate equal educational opportunity in post-secondary education."

**Dr. Morton explained his "nay" vote. I voted 'no' because I think what the motion seeks to accomplish, namely greater input, is not precluded from the original recommendation of the Subcommittee. The recommendation of the majority of the Subcommittee does not suggest program. It is not that simplistic It seeks to get a registration of intent of the Board and then send that intent through a process that allows for all of the input to which Gorton has referred. Secondly, the Advisory Committee on Equal Access is already considering the many problems having to do with admissions otherwise involved in the total problem. Therefore, it seems to me that it is a simple matter of putting on the table the intent of the Board and then charging the Superintendent to come up with proposals that have the pros and cons, and input from all persons involved as to what can be done in the area and moving toward a solution. It seems to me we have had as goals two items in particular for six years, and I, like Mr. O'Neil, wonder why we set goals if we don't intend to implement them. This is not an implementation in terms of specifics. It is a report to the Superintendent you are now charging to move toward the implementation of a goal that has been set for six years."

copies to: Dr. T. Harry McKinney
Mr. Evan Wilner

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 13 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION